

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARIES

A standard linear barcode is located in the top left corner of the white label. It consists of vertical black lines of varying widths on a white background.

3 1761 00371640 4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
The Arcadia Fund

<https://archive.org/details/cornellstudiesin21unse>

9
265

7

CORNELL STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXI

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS
IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Collected and Annotated by
J. F. MOUNTFORD

CORNELL STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Edited by
Eugene Plumb Andrews
Charles Love Durham
Herbert Charles Elmer
Horace Leonard Jones
James Frederick Mountford

P
Mr.
C.

Quotations from Classical Authors in Medieval Latin Glossaries

Collected and Annotated
by

James Frederick Mountford, M.A., D.Litt.

*Professor of the Classics in Cornell University
Fereday Fellow, St. John's College, Oxford*



204423
5.1.26.

Published for Cornell University by
LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
NEW YORK AND LONDON

1925

Copyright, 1925
By CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Printed in the United States of America

PA
25
CT
V. 21

CORNELL PUBLICATIONS PRINTING COMPANY
ITHACA, NEW YORK

PREFACE

THIS study may fairly be regarded as an adjunct to the edition of the *Liber Glossarum* which is shortly to be published under the auspices of the British Academy. It has a threefold purpose: (a) to collect in a convenient form the more important citations from classical authors preserved in medieval Latin glossaries; (b) to demonstrate as far as is possible the value and source of these interesting items; (c) to illustrate in a selected group of items the relations between the MSS. of the *Liber Glossarum* rather more fully than was possible in the edition of the whole work.

All the quotation-glosses here printed are taken from the *Liber Glossarum* and the PP-glossary; but the title of this treatise is fully justified since the few quotation-items that are to be found in other glossaries are mentioned at appropriate places (e.g. Part I, note to § 55; Part II, Nos. 7, 35). Citations from Sacred Scripture are discussed only as far as their presence might affect our views of the origin of citations from profane writers.

To Professors W. M. Lindsay and Lane Cooper, who read through my manuscript, I owe thanks for ready and valued counsel; the responsibility for errors of fact and for mistaken judgments is mine. Professor C. L. Durham gave generous aid in the reading of the proofs.

J. F. M.

Ithaca, New York,

May, 1925.

PART I

PART I: INTRODUCTION

1. SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY. In the portentous medieval collection of glosses and miscellaneous excerpts now known as the *Liber Glossarum*¹ there are numerous items in which passages are cited from authors of the Republican, Augustan, and Silver ages of Latin literature, sometimes from Latin versions of the Bible, and occasionally from Christian poets. Many of these items, however, prove to be nothing more nor less than excerpts from authors such as Isidore, Augustine, Ambrose, and others whose works are already published. Fortunately the task of discovering the source of some of them was lightened for us by the compiler of the *Liber Glossarum*, who often affixed marginal labels to his items. Thus the marginal sign 'Esidori' indicates that:

Eruca frondium vermis in holus, vel in pampino involuta, ab erodendo dicta. de qua meminit Plautus (Cist. 728) "imitatus nequam bestiam et maleficam involutam in pampino in�icat se" (= Lib. Gloss. ER 250)

is merely an excerpt from Isidore's *Etymologiae* 12, 5, 9. Even when a label is lacking in the *Liber Glossarum* (which we shall hereafter refer to by the abbreviation Lib.) a short search will often reveal the source of the item. Thus MA 770:

¹ This is the title sanctioned by usage, though in France the title *Glossarium Ansileubi* is preferred on slender evidence. But as Goetz points out (Corp. Gloss. Lat. I. 104), an old catalogue of the Lorsch library (now Vat. Pal. lat. 1877) refers to the work as 'Liber grandis glossarum'. This MS. is really two catalogues, the earlier (foll. 1-84) belonging to the early ninth century (though Gust. Becker in Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui, pp. 120 ff., wrongly refers it to the tenth). On fol. 32v is the entry "Liber grandis glosarum ex dictis diversorum coadunatus in uno cod." This designation may be almost contemporary with the first publication of the *Liber Glossarum* (if the compiler was Adelhard, abbot of Corbie) and was possibly the title by which the work was first known. It certainly has a stronger claim than the other two.

Since the provenience of the *Liber Glossarum* is still in doubt, it is relevant to call attention here to a matter which I observed too late for notice in the edition of the *Liber Glossarum*. The item ME 40 (Medicor) appears in the MEDA-section. The compiler's staff placed it there through misreading 'ic' as 'a'; indeed the Paris MS. of the *Liber Glossarum* actually gives 'Medaor'. Only at Corbie (where the open 'a' of the ab-type is very like the 'ic' of other scriptoria) would 'medicor' be misread and transcribed as 'medaor' and consequently be placed in the MEDA-section (cf. Lindsay, Palaeog. Lat. I, 9). From this item therefore we may at least conclude that the last stage of arranging the *Liber Glossarum* in strict alphabetical order was undertaken at Corbie during the abbacy of Adelhard.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Malleus vocatus quia, dum quid calet et molle est, caedit et producit. marcus malleus maior; et dictus marcus quod maior sit ad caendum et fortior. martellus, mediocris. marculus malleus pusillus. Lucilius (1165) "et velut in fabrica fervens cum marculus ferrum multorum magnis ictibus tundit,"

is taken word for word from Isidore Etym. 19, 7, 2. Sometimes an item in Lib. diverges slightly from the words of an earlier writer, and we are in doubt whether the compiler of the glossary has merely remodelled a passage of Isidore or Augustine for the reader's convenience or whether he has taken the item from a cognate, but quite distinct, source which is no longer extant. Thus BI 23:

Bibula papyrus dicta eo quod humorem bibat. Lucanus (4, 136) "Conficitur bibula Memphis carta papyro",

is not an exact transcription from Isidore Etym. 6, 10, 1; but the common errors of *conficitur* and *carta* for Lucan's *conseritur* and *cumba* make it virtually certain that the item of Lib. is only a remodelled version of the Isidore-passage. If we take into consideration the size of Lib., there really are very few items which cause us serious difficulty in deciding whether we are dealing with known material recast for glossary purposes or with some new and distinct source.

To assess the value and trace the history of quotations in items which are merely excerpts from works already published are tasks for those who investigate the sources of Isidore, Augustine, Ambrose, and others. Whether Isidore, for example, obtained his quotations of Lucilius from a copy of that author, or whether he derived his knowledge through some intermediate channel, is a question which can be discussed only incidentally, if at all, in this treatise. The field of our investigation is very different. The material with which we shall be concerned is the residue of quotation-items which remains over when we have accounted for all those which can be traced to a definite and still extant source of Lib., like Isidore's Etymologiae or Differentiae. Nor shall we take into account such items as AN 389:

"Ante pudor quam te violo": antequam te pudor contamino; for the marginal label 'Virgili' shows that it came from a not very valuable collection of marginal notes in Virgil MSS. Nor will CI 218:

Cio: voco, interdum et pro clamo, ut si dicam "omnes ciebam eos"

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

and a few similar items (but cf. No. 254 below) claim attention; for even though they may be parts of Virgil-scholia, the citations are only makeshift illustrations, concocted for a particular purpose and are of no literary worth.

The residue thus defined amounts to just over five hundred items in which, generally speaking, the meaning, gender, or usage of a word or phrase is illustrated by an apposite citation. Our chief aim is to discover the sources from which these items ultimately came and the channels through which they reached Lib. The demonstration of their relation to other works containing ancient lore is incidental to our quest but will perhaps prove equally interesting.

2. VALUE OF THE ITEMS. The famous Pila-item (No. 95 below) with its valuable citation from Lucilius needs no commendation. We shall be in a better position to judge Baehrens' attribution of the Cordipugis-item (No. 94 below) to Lucilius when we get a clear view of the source from which Lib. derived it. And who will deny that citations from Varro, Catullus, and the lost works of Sallust have a very real interest? Furthermore, the earliest MSS. of Lib. belong to the beginning of the ninth century, and such comparatively early readings for the text of Plautus, Lucan, and Statius (to say nothing of the four authors already mentioned) are of some importance. Even when the readings afforded by Lib. are not preferable to those presented in our MSS. of the individual authors, the testimony of Lib. (as Hosius realized when preparing his edition of Lucan) is worthy of notice. The precise importance to be attached to new readings depends very much on the origin of the quotation-items and the means whereby they have reached Lib. If most of them came from Virgil-scholia, as seems likely, we must bear in mind the habits of commentators in quoting carelessly or from memory, and we must remember that a word which, for the purpose of the commentator, was not of great importance may have been variously corrupted and altered. The new fragments of Virgil-scholia which these items are thought to preserve are by no means to be despised.

3. GOETZ' THEORY. In his monograph 'Der Liber Glossarum'¹ and in the Preface to vol. V of Corp. Gloss. Lat., Goetz

¹Abhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften (Phil.-Hist. Classe), Band 13, 1891 (Leipzig).

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

has indicated his view that these quotation-glosses came from a 'Glossar mit zahlreichen Citaten,' designed to illustrate the meaning, gender, and usage of words, and that the compiler of Lib. took his items from such a quotation-glossary. It is quite true that such a description would fit the majority of our items; but there are items like Nos. 24 and 207 where the lemma and the quotation bear no simple relation to one another. Furthermore, it is difficult to see why, side by side with many citations from Virgil and Lucan, there should be only one from Livy, two from Catullus, three from Lucretius, three from Ovid, three from Persius, and so on. The net is spread wide but the catch is surprisingly unequal and the theory of Goetz affords no explanation. Even if we accepted Goetz' view, we should still be bound to inquire from what materials and on what principle the 'Citatenglossar' was compiled to give rise to such a selection of authors and citations. Again, we find that not only is Donatus quoted in items of the type we are considering but that his work is also referred to, without being cited, in other items of Lib. On Goetz' theory the relation between items which quote Donatus and those which merely refer to him is left unconsidered. It is just possible that:

Frugi: parci. Donatus "Cartaginenses accubent ut luxorios, Itali sedent ut frugi et fortes" (= No. 23 below)

comes from one source and:

Lucifer: genere neutro dicitur, ut Donatus

from another. But no one will deny that a theory which derives both items from one and the same source will have an *a priori* advantage over the hypothesis of Goetz. Indeed this principle may at once be enunciated: if we are to get to the root of the matter we shall be bound to consider, not merely the quotation-glosses themselves, but their relations to other glosses of Lib. which contain ancient lore. In short, as far as Goetz' theory fits the facts at all, it amounts to little more than an admission that there are in Lib. a number of quotation-items which may be grouped together, but whose source is obscure. The 'Citatenglossar' is vague and ill-defined and does not afford a full and satisfactory solution of the problems involved.

4. WESSNER'S THEORY. In Corp. Gloss. Lat. I, Wessner propounds an ingenious theory to account not only for the

nature and variety of the quotation-items in Lib., but also for the fact that many of them are found also in the PP-glossary.¹ He regards Lib. and the PP-glossary as descendants of a common parent from which both obtained their quotation-items. The compiler of the common parent had, according to Wessner, derived the items from various sources: (1) from scholia of varied provenience and unequal value found in a MS. of Virgil; (2) from glosses or scholia in a Lucan-MS.; (3) from glosses or scholia in a Statius-MS.; (4) from glosses in a Terence-MS.; and (5) from notes which he himself had made, or collected, while reading such authors as Plautus, Cicero, Sallust, Solinus, and Dracontius. The fragments of Lucilius, Lucretius, and in some cases the passages from Plautus and Sallust, are supposed to have come from the first source, that is, from Virgil-scholia.

5. CRITICISM OF WESSNER'S THEORY. Wessner's investigation was to some extent hampered by the fact that the excerpts printed by Goetz (Corp. Gloss. Lat. V pp. 161-255), which alone were available, did not present one-half of the quotation-items of Lib. But let us freely admit the attractiveness of the theory. It has the advantage of not positing a single source such as a 'Citatenglossar' for all the items. It explains why there should be many Lucan-citations and few from Lucilius; for they are supposed to have come to Lib. by different channels—the Lucan from a text of the author and the Lucilius from chance quotations in Virgil-scholia. The theory accounts admirably for items like No. 66 where the lemma-word or phrase is confined to the author whose line is quoted; for such items certainly seem to have come from notes on a text of the particular author. And finally the simplicity of items like No. 171 seems to be immediately explained if we suppose that the glossary-compiler remodelled marginal notes and added the line to which the note referred.

Wessner has apparently entrenched himself in a strong position; for if a Plautus-citation is introduced in such a way that it can scarcely have been derived direct from a text of the author, then Virgil-scholia can be appealed to as the source. Yet, as we shall see, it is certain that some of the citations of Plautus,

¹ This glossary, printed under the title 'Placidus Codicis Parisini' in Corp. Gloss. Lat. V pp. 104-158, may conveniently be known by this name since the extant fragments are preserved at Paris and Prague.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Terence, Cicero, and Sallust have come from Virgil-scholia and it is very probable that the great majority of them are derived from the same source. Indeed the number of non-Virgilian quotations which we could with any show of reason suppose to have been directly derived from the texts of the particular authors (if we exclude Lucan and Statius-glosses) is small. Anything like a thorough scrutiny of the non-Virgilian items brings us face to face with the difficulty which presented itself when we were considering the theory of Goetz; if the compiler of Lib., or of its parent, remodelled marginal notes for his glossary we must suppose that his reading was varied but unfruitful.

Yet we need not pursue further our criticism of the details of Wessner's theory; for the basis on which it rests is unsound. Let us consider the PP-glossary first, since, as its less rigorous alphabetical arrangement shows, it must be nearer to the supposed parent-glossary than Lib. It has been demonstrated that the PP-glossary (which we shall hereafter call PP) is really a juxtaposition of (A) a composite glossary and (B) Placidus-glosses.¹ The composite part (A) consists of material derived from still earlier glossaries such as Abstrusa, Abolita, and Glossae Vergiliana. It is clear from the structure of PP that, if the parent-glossary contained the Placidus-glosses (as Wessner believes it did), they were not fused with the rest, but were merely juxtaposed as they still are in PP. Now it is not clear when Wessner speaks of the compiler of the parent-glossary whether he means the man who put together the (A) and (B) parts of the glossary, or whether he means the man who put together the (A) part from its constituent glossaries. Actually it must be the latter whom Wessner has in mind: for any accretions at the stage when (A) and (B) were juxtaposed would be as obvious as the Placidus-accretions. Now in point of fact the items with quotations are an inseparable part of the material of the (A) part, and if any one man collected them that man cannot be identified with any one later than the compiler of the (A) part of PP. Is there then any real ground for supposing that these quotation-items were added by the personal research of the compiler of the (A) section? Scarcely; for *half* of the

¹ See my article 'The Paris Placidus', in Archiv. Lat. Med. Aev. 1924, pp. 31-49.

items (including hundreds without citations) found in that section of PP are not to be found in any other extant glossary (excepting Lib.). Did the compiler of the (A) part of the 'parent' add *all* these various items himself from his own excogitations and reading, or did he make use of a glossary or glossaries which are no longer extant? The most reasonable answer is that he possessed at least one glossary which is now lost; and if that be so, may not the quotation-items also have been derived from the same or another lost glossary? If Wessner had accounted for every item in PP excepting the quotation-items, we might have followed him in attributing the citation-glosses to the compiler of the (A) section of the 'parent'. The compiler of a medieval glossary was not a *Verrius Flaccus*; he did not produce half of his material out of his own head, or search it all out for himself. He based his glossary on pre-existing work, on smaller glossaries, or on sets of *Glossae Collectae*, and only to a very limited extent did he 'create' his glossary. We know enough of the growth of glossaries to realize that only as a desperate resort should we posit any extended research on the part of a compiler. That some lost glossary was used in the compilation of the 'parent' of PP is not merely possible; it is distinctly probable. If that be admitted, we must also agree that the quotation-items may have come from a lost glossary.

If the line of argument we have just pursued weakens Wessner's theory there is another consideration which is almost fatal to it. We have for the time being tacitly accepted the view (first propounded by Goetz) that PP and Lib. did in fact have a common parent, from which these quotation-items might have come. It is quite true that a great deal of the material found in PP also appears in Lib.; but by no means all of it. One-tenth of the items of PP are not in Lib., though PP is a very much smaller glossary. The existence of one common parent, as has been shown elsewhere, so far from being proved, is open to very serious doubt.¹ All that we can say with confidence is this: PP is based on a number of pre-existing glossaries which happened to be used also in the compilation of Lib. The evidence simply does not justify us in speaking of a single common parent. Once more we are forced back upon the constituent glossaries of PP

¹ See my article 'The Paris Placidus', *Archiv. Lat. Med. Aev.* 1924, pp. 31-49.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

and Lib. if we wish to investigate the origin of the quotation-items. We must explore all possibilities in the way of discovering the limits of the lost glossary or glossaries before we dare call in a shadowy compiler as a 'deus ex machina.'

6. THE THEORY PROPOSED.¹ We have reason to be grateful to the compiler of Lib.; for the marginal labels which he affixed to the items are, in spite of the errors and slips of copyists, invaluable. Some of the Lib.-items which reappear in PP are shown by their labels in Lib. to have come from Placidus, others from Eucherius, others from Isidore, others from a collection of marginal notes in a MS. of Virgil, and a large number from a source which is indicated by the label De Glis, that is, De Glossis. Now the quotation-items are not all labelled in Lib.; but those which are, and they are many, have the label De Glis. That shows us the direction in which we are to look for the origin of the citation-glosses. Careful scrutiny of thousands of these De Glis items has shown that they represent: (1) the Abstrusa-glossary; (2) the Abolita-glossary; (3) a small Graeco-Latin glossary; and (4) an unidentified corpus of glosses. To this unidentified corpus, which outside Lib. and PP is unparalleled, our quotation-items belong; and our problem resolves itself into finding the source or sources of this material and in particular of that part of it which consists of the quotation-glosses. There is no *a priori* ground whatsoever for attributing any of these items to a compiler's personal investigations.

The solution which we shall propose is not one which can be accepted without careful proof; but it is one which, without being vague and meaningless, is thought to satisfy the facts. In short, the great majority of the quotation-items came to Lib. and PP from Virgil-scholia by way of the Abstrusa-glossary at a time when that glossary was extant in a much fuller form than our existing MSS. present. Before this hypothesis can be accepted, even as a working approximation, four conditions must be satisfied. It must be shown first that Abstrusa, as we now possess it, is a mere epitome of a fuller Abstrusa-glossary (cf. §7); secondly that Lib. (and PP) made use of that fuller form of Abstrusa (which we shall refer to as 'Abstrusa'; cf. §8); thirdly that 'Abstrusa' was based partly on Virgil-scholia (cf. §9); and

¹ For a tentative statement of the theory, see Classical Quarterly 15 pp. 192-194.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

fourthly that the unidentified De Glis materials, and particularly the quotation-glosses, either show traces of relationship to our extant Abstrusa or to extant Virgil-scholia, or at least are of such a nature that Virgil-scholia are not an impossible source (cf. §§11-12). In addition we must consider whether any items show relationship to the Abolita-glossary (also a source of De Glis material; cf. § 50).

7. THE FULLER ABSTRUSA. The existence of a fuller form of Abstrusa and the use of Virgil-scholia as one of its sources have been demonstrated by Professor H. J. Thomson.¹ Recently in *Corp. Gloss. Lat. I*, Wessner, without facing the position squarely perhaps, has expressed disagreement. The position which Thomson established is fundamental; and it will be pertinent to adduce here a few of the most cogent proofs in support of his view.

Our knowledge of Abstrusa is derived from two main sources, in one of which Abstrusa appears in conjunction with the Abolita-glossary.² Of this latter source the Vatican MS. 3321 (*Vat.*) and the Cassinensis (*a*) are typical. The other source is two MSS. in which Abstrusa appears alone, the Paris MSS. 2341 (*c*) and 7691 (*d*). That Abstrusa, as we have it, is curtailed, perhaps seriously, is shown by the cumulative evidence of several facts:

(a) Our MSS. show divergencies which are clearly due to different methods of curtailment. Thus the full gloss:

Aeger dicitur animo tristis, aegrotus corpore infirmus (cf. *Serv. on Aen. 1, 208*)

appears in *cd* as:—

Aeger dicitur animo, aegrotus corpore,

in *a* as:—

Aeger dicitur animo verum tristis,

and in *Vat.* as:—

Aeger aegrotus vel tristis aut infirmus (= *Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV* 60, 49).

¹ *Journ. of Phil.* 35, 257 ff.

² In *Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV* pp. 3-198. Abstrusa-glosses are those not enclosed in square brackets; the remainder (with a few exceptions) are Abolita-glosses.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

(b) The pure Abstrusa MSS. (*cd*) sometimes exhibit a gloss in a shorter form than *Vat.* and *a*. Thus a long gloss on 'Labyrinthum' is omitted entirely by *Vat.* and appears in *cd* only in an abbreviated version. Other examples are numerous.

(c) Sometimes *c* or *d* or both of them omit glosses which appear in an Abstrusa-section of *Vat. a*; for examples see Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV 82, 33; 83, 49; 90, 22; 91, 14-37.

(d) On the other hand, *cd* preserve items in a fuller form than *Vat. a*. Thus the gloss (Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV 33, 40):

Caerula: nigra, a cerae colore tractum; puto est autem nox pallore suffusa appears in *Vat. a* without the second sentence, which can scarcely be regarded as a scribe's addition. Notice especially Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV 143, 34 (app. crit.).

(e) Examples like Corp. Gloss. Lat. IV 187, 32, where *c* alone presents the lemma 'Turrita' (without interpretation), seem to indicate that all our MSS. of Abstrusa have omitted entire glosses.

These facts cannot be explained on the ground that one MS., or group of MSS., shows a tendency to curtailment. All the MSS. in their various ways show curtailment; and it is therefore probable that even if we combine the evidence of *Vat. acd* we shall not always obtain the full Abstrusa-items, nor indeed shall we be certain of obtaining even fragments of every item which originally belonged to the glossary.

Happily we can pursue the matter further with the aid of other glossaries such as the St. Gall-glossary, Abavus, and the Ampronian glossaries, which we know to be based partly on Abstrusa. There we find that an Abstrusa-gloss, as we might expect, is not infrequently presented in a fuller form than any of the Abstrusa MSS. shows. Thus the Abstrusa-item:

Peculatus: furatus de peculio

is found in the First Ampronian as:—

Peculatus: furatus de peculio publico.

When several derivative glossaries show the same addition, the case for attributing the longer version to 'Abstrusa' is immeasurably strengthened. Thus the Abstrusa-item:

Arvina: caro ferina

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

appears in Affatim and the Second Ampronian as:—

Arvina: caro pinguis ferina,

and in Lib. as:—

Arvina: caro pinguis ferina vel mappa interius sanguinis.

To the Abstrusa-gloss:

Discerniculum: ornamentum capitis

the Corpus and Second Ampronian glossaries add the words 'virginalis ex auro'.

These examples and others, which may be found in Thomson's article, make it absolutely certain that the Abstrusa which our MSS. present is only a curtailed version of a larger glossary which was used by the compilers of later glossaries such as Affatim, Corpus, the Ampronians, Lib., and PP.

8. THE USE OF 'ABSTRUSA' FOR LIB. That Lib. (and PP) made use of the fuller form of Abstrusa (as well as of an epitomized version akin to the pure Abstrusa MSS. *cd*) admits of no doubt; for not only do we find in Lib. items which are fuller than those of our extant Abstrusa, but we find the fuller form and the shorter side by side. Copious examples to prove the point may be found in Thomson's article.¹

9. VIRGIL-SCHOLIA AS A SOURCE OF 'ABSTRUSA'. Two sources are definitely known to have been used for the compilation of 'Abstrusa'. The one is a series of glosses on a mixed (Itala and Vulgate) text of the Bible;² the other is a set of Virgil-scholia. Thus in the following items there is a connexion between Abstrusa and Servius which cannot be due to mere coincidence but can only be fairly explained on the ground that Abstrusa and Servius are drawing on the same or similar sources:

Aequora: maria vel campi, ab aequalitate dicti (cf. Serv. on Aen. 2, 69: aequora vero modo maria, alibi campos . . . dictum est ab aequalitate).

Canoris: chordis (cf. Serv. on Aen. 6, 120: fidibus canoris: bene sonantibus chordis).

Phalerae: ornamenta equorum (= Serv. on Aen. 9, 357).

Latex: aqua quae latet in venis (cf. Serv. on Aen. 1, 686: latex proprie aqua est, ab eo quod intra terrae venas lateat).

¹ Journ. of Phil. 35, 278. See also my article in Archiv. Lat. Med. Aevi, 1924, p. 43-44.

² Cf. footnotes to §48.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

In the following glosses of Abstrusa there is a correspondence with the Berne Scholia on Virgil:—

Carchesia: genus poculorum (= Berne Sch. on Geo. 4, 380).

Cana mala: lanuginem habentia, id est Cydonia (cf. Berne Sch. on Ecl. 2, 51: cana mala: candida poma vel genus hirsutum. tenera lanugine: id est lanuginem habentia. cf. also Serv. at the same place: mala dicit Cydonea quae lanuginis plena sunt).

Fasces: honores (cf. Berne Sch. on Geo. 2, 495: id est honores. cf. also Serv. honores qui a populo praestabantur).

These and other examples adduced by Thomson make it quite clear that the compiler of 'Abstrusa' had at his disposal a set of Virgil-scholia which sometimes agree with Servius, sometimes with Servius Danielis, sometimes with the Berne Scholia, and sometimes with Philargyrius. Whether this set of scholia was actually the commentary of Donatus or whether it was a variorum-commentary based on Donatus, it is at least certain that it was a valuable source which we would give much to recover.

10. THE RECOVERY OF THE FULLER ABSTRUSA. We have seen that our present Abstrusa is a curtailed version of a larger glossary; we know of other glossaries which had access to the fuller Abstrusa; and we know something of the type of material which went to the compilation of the fuller Abstrusa. It therefore follows that we can recover with a fair degree of certainty parts of the lost 'Abstrusa' and we can frequently say of an isolated gloss that it originally must have appeared in 'Abstrusa'. Doubtless this lost 'Abstrusa' affords a spacious field in which the foolish may disport without fear of censure and knaves play tricks unapprehended. But about the existence of 'Abstrusa' there can be no doubt, nor can any and every stray gloss be attributed to it. There are several types of gloss which can be claimed for 'Abstrusa':—

(1) A gloss which is longer than the extant Abstrusa item but appears in several of the derivative glossaries is almost surely 'Abstrusa'.

(2) A gloss appearing in one derivative glossary but longer than the Abstrusa-version may be from 'Abstrusa'; but if the interpretation in Abstrusa is of such an obvious nature that any one might have used it to explain the lemma word, then the longer gloss cannot be claimed for 'Abstrusa' with full certainty.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

In every case one has to consider whether the compiler of the single derivative glossary has added the additional matter from some source unknown to us rather than from 'Abstrusa'.

(3) A gloss which does not appear in Abstrusa but appears in several derivative glossaries may be 'Abstrusa'. But since the derivative glossaries also used the Abolita-glossary as a source, there is always a possibility that these glosses may belong not to 'Abstrusa' but to a fuller form of Abolita. Nor is the fact that such glosses may have reference to a passage of Virgil a sufficient indication of their origin in 'Abstrusa'; for marginal notes to Virgil were one of the sources of Abolita, and unless the interpretation is something more than a mere marginal comment we cannot press a claim for origin in 'Abstrusa'.

(4) A gloss found in one only of the derivative glossaries and not in Abstrusa can only be claimed for 'Abstrusa' if it agrees with some extant Virgil-scholium or at least is of such a nature that a Virgil-scholium is a probable source.

11. THE 'DE GLS' MATERIAL. In this section is given a selection of items (some being definitely labelled 'De Glis') which indicate that there is a residuum of ancient lore and scholarly comment in Lib.:—

Capellae: haec capellae, non hae capellae, ut Donatus (= CA 289. cf. Serv. Danielis on Geo. 3, 305).

Characteres: id est modi elocutionum, dicit esse Donatus quos Graeci *χαρακτῆρας* vocant, *ἰσχνός* qui tenuis, *μέσος* qui moderatus *ἀδρός* qui validus intellegitur (=CA 636, labelled De Glis.; cf. Donat. Vita Vergili 254).

Charybdis: generis feminini Donatus (=CA 697).¹

Cebetem: quem Virgilius dilexit nimis, cum Alexandro quem Alexim vocavit (=CE 3, labelled De Glis. cf. Donat. Vita Vergili 29).

Codrus: nobilissimus pastor significatur et poeta quem Vergilius (Valgius) elegit laudat (=CO 59. cf. Serv. Danielis on Ecl. 7, 22).

Coetu: circulo non conventu dicit Donatus quod Graeci *κύκλω* dicunt (= CO 85. cf. Aen. 1, 398).

Corbes: feminini generis dicit esse Donatus (=CO 2148. cf. Serv. on Geo 1, 165).

Genitivus casus: status est, ut dicit Donatus (=GE 146. Found also in PP).

Iapige ferri: Iapigem Varro ventum vocat ab occidente Apulia (=IA 144. cf. Serv. Danielis on Aen. 8, 710).

¹The label De Glis affixed to CA 696 (an Isidore excerpt) may properly refer to this item.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Infandum: nota esse adverbium, ut Donatus dicit (=IN 1195. cf. Aen. 1, 251).

Laena: amictus rotundus duplex, ut Iulius Suavis; Suetonius (frag. 167) vero ait toga qua infibulati flamines sacrificant; huius vestis inventor Laenas appellatus est (=LA 211. cf. Serv. Danielis on Aen. 4, 262 where this information is given *without* mention of the authorities. cf. also Usener, Kl. Schriften II 193).

Levia: levia ut Donatus (=LE 343. cf. PP: Levia, lena).

Lucifer: genere neutro dicitur ut Donatus (=LU 69, labelled De Gls. cf. PP and Virgil, Ecl. 8, 17).

Maecenas: qui Virgilium Octaviano Augusto commendavit (=ME 27).

Napeae: deae florum agrestium, sicut Naidas Veneris, Oreadas Diana, ut Donatus (=NA 53. cf. Geo. 4, 535).

Notios et Borios: duo poli dicit Donatus quod sint quasi Notus et Boreas (=NO 270).

O Lenaee: [O] Lenaeus ad quem Virgilius loquitur pro omni genere frumentum (=OL 17, labelled De Gls. Appears in PP also).

Pampinum: feminino genere dixit Varro et facit 'harum pampinorum'; ergo 'haec pampinus' et 'harum pampinorum' (=PA 240. Appears in PP also).

Panchaia: ipsa est Arabia ut Donatus (=PA 253, labelled De Gls. cf. PP also).

Proceres: Varro dixit ligna esse tecta prominentia, quod procedunt extra parietes sic appellata (=PR 1687. cf. Aen. 3, 58 and Sabbadini Berl. Phil. Woch. 26, 607).

Quattuor species dividit Virgilius boum: maritos gregis, victimas, aratores, armentivos; et equorum quattuor: currules, dorsuarios, admissarios, armentivos. (=QUA 282).

Seria: necessaria, gravia ut Donatus (=SE 526, labelled De Gls. Appears in PP also).

Simonides: poeta quidam qui ait Cupidinem ex Venere tantum fuisse natum (=SI 286. cf. Serv. on Aen. 1, 664).

Tucca et Varius: emendatores Aeneidae (=TU 25, labelled De Gls. cf. Donat. Vit. Vergili 140).

Trahas: quidam putant esse quibus in area colligitur pabulum. Donatus vero dicit vehicula esse trahas sine rotis (=TR 107. cf. Serv. on Geo. 1, 164).

Uterus: genere masculino et uterum neutro dicitur, ut Donatus grammaticus ait (=UT 22).

No one will deny that these items have come almost certainly from Virgil-scholia either directly or indirectly. The mention of Donatus and Varro and the parallels with extant scholia point to a commentary at least as valuable as any we possess. The fact that some of these items appear also in PP makes it clear that some glossary based on Virgil-scholia, not the scholia themselves, was the immediate source from which Lib. and PP

derived their items independently. And, as we have seen, 'Abstrusa' is, in the present state of our knowledge, the most obvious source to which we can refer such items. We need therefore make no apology for attributing an unusually learned item to 'Abstrusa' or for regarding 'Abstrusa' as the source of many interesting glosses which appear only in Lib. and PP.

12. QUOTATION-ITEMS AND 'ABSTRUSA'. Of the unidentified De Gl's material of Lib., it is highly probable that the items just considered come to Lib. from Virgil-scholia by way of 'Abstrusa'. Can the same be said of the quotation-glosses which are also a part of the unidentified De Gl's material? A collection of Virgil-scholia at any rate is precisely the place from which we might expect medieval glossaries to derive citations from Lucilius, Plautus, Lucretius, Catullus, and the lost works of Sallust. That axiom should never be forgotten in dealing with medieval glosses. Nor are connexions between these quotation items and Virgil-scholia lacking, as may be seen from the notes to items 10, 28, 106, 128, 173, 224, 226 below. These are just a few of the quotation-items which are more or less similar to extant scholia and that similarity is too close to be due to coincidence. It is also clear that the scholia on which these items are based were not simply the scholia of Servius, Philargyrius, or any extant series; more probably they were a variorum-collection containing some very old comment alongside of much trifling and useless material. In short, the type of scholia from which these items must originally have come cannot be distinguished from that set of scholia from which the Virgilian parts of 'Abstrusa' were compiled. And if we labelled the above items as 'Abstrusa' it would be difficult for any one to deny that reason was on our side.

Yet such a demonstration of the source of *some* of the quotation-items and the probable channel through which they have reached Lib. is not at all sufficient. Wessner, even if he denied that they came to Lib. by way of 'Abstrusa', would at least freely admit that in some way or other they did come from Virgil-scholia; but he would admit this of only a few items. Our task now is to inquire, not into the general possibility of these quotation items having come from Virgil-scholia by way of 'Abstrusa'—for that has been quite sufficiently indicated—but to discover how many of these items have come from one source and by one channel.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

13. PRELIMINARIES. 'Abstrusa' can no more be produced than Goetz' *Citatenglossar* or Wessner's 'compiler'; the reader must decide which of the three theories fits the facts best and is most probable. It must be realized however that the task of proving that the quotation-items are really 'Abstrusa' and are derived ultimately from Virgil-scholia, will not be easy. Some difficulties which we may expect to encounter must first be discussed.

First. A glossary-maker who used Virgil-scholia as a quarry for his glossary would in many cases entirely cover his traces. Thus on finding at Ecl. 3, 16, on the word 'fures', a scholium similar to that preserved by Servius:

furta enim specialiter servorum sunt: sic Plautus de servo 'homo es
trium litterarum', id est fur

he might remodel his material thus:

Trium litterarum homo: fur; Plautus 'trium litterarum homo',
which is precisely the gloss we find in Lib. (TR 423). We know
that Servius does not by any means represent all the scholia that
existed in his time; and it is a fortunate chance that we can in
this case trace our item back. Otherwise we should have been
tempted to say that the item was due to a marginal note in a
text of Plautus and should not have thought of any other pos-
sibility. In how many other cases which seem to have no close
connexion with passages of Virgil may not the same process have
happened? There may be critics who will view with suspicion
this appeal to lost scholia; and they would have some justifica-
tion if it were not so clearly indicated that in Lib. there are
fragments of very valuable ancient comment from such a source.

Secondly. The compiler of Lib. and very possibly the com-
piler of 'Abstrusa' had a habit of dividing up a long item into
several smaller ones. Indeed the narrowness of the columns of a
page would sometimes lead to the unintentional division of long
items into smaller ones which seem to us complete in themselves.
Thus a scholium resembling that preserved by Servius Danielis
on Aen. 4, 335:

Promeritam: praestitisse et bene gessisse; et est sermo de his qui per
contrarium magis lucent: Terentius 'ita me velim ames promerentem
pater', id est bene agentem. et congruit ut praestet qui bene agit;

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

contra 'commeritus' qui aliquid delinquit, ut alibi ipse Terentius 'quid commerui aut peccavi, pater?', id est quid male egi? et est sensus: quantacumque enumerare potueris in me tuo beneficio conlata, eorum tibi debere gratiam non repugno

has been broken up into:

Commeritus: qui delinquit ut 'quid' (=CO 397, labelled De Gl),
Commerui: aut peccavi pariter (=CO 1167).

Promeritus: apud antiquos dicebatur qui quid benefecisset; 'promeritam': profuisse, praestitisse (=PR 504, labelled De Gl).

Neither 'commerui' nor 'commeritus' is to be found in Virgil; but he would be a bold man who, knowing that remnants of Virgil-scholia are extant in Lib., would attribute the Terence-citation in CO 397 and CO 1167 to a text of Terence with marginal notes rather than to Virgil-scholia. The shortness, simplicity, or self-sufficiency of an item cannot be used as a safe argument for proving that it has not come from Virgil-scholia.¹

14. GENERAL PROPOSITIONS. We have so far seen that some of these quotation-items may very reasonably be claimed for 'Abstrusa'; and that there are some very obvious difficulties which will confront us as soon as we try to prove that all the items come from the same source. Much trouble will be saved in our investigation if we lay down several guiding propositions which will serve at the same time to forestall inevitable criticisms. First, three positive ones:

(a) An item which is Abstrusa + a quotation may be 'Abstrusa'. Thus with Abstrusa:

Detrudit: excludit, eminat, propellit

compare these items of Lib.:

Detrudit: excludit. Lucanus 'nunc sude detrudit muris, (=DE 1221),
Detrudit: excludit, eminat, expellit, propellit (=DE 1222),
Detrudit: emicat, propellit (=DE 1223),

which seem to be 'split' versions of a longer gloss than is preserved by our extant Abstrusa. And if this is so, the Lucan quotation may also be a part of 'Abstrusa'. An objector will ask why the quotation should not have been added afterwards. The reply is

¹ For another good illustration, compare Serv. on Aen. 8, 314 (Indigenae, id est inde geniti, *αὐτόχθονες*) with Lib. IN 425 (Indigenae: ibi geniti, labelled De Gl) and IN 144 (Indigenae: quos Graeci autuconas dicunt, labelled De Gl).

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

that if the compiler of 'Abstrusa' or of Lib. had indulged in personal research, then the quotation in this and other similar items might be regarded as an apposite addition to the original gloss; but that since 'Abstrusa' made use of Virgil-scholia, it is more natural to regard the quotation as part of the scholium which the glossary has preserved. On the other hand the equation: Abstrusa + quotation = 'Abstrusa' must not be pressed too far (cf. § 10).

Aequ: similiter. Lucanus 'venerabilis aequ'
reminds us of the Abstrusa-item:—

Aequ: similiter;

but the interpretation is short and obvious and can by itself afford no argument for attributing the longer item to 'Abstrusa'. Indeed if we accepted this simple coincidence of interpretation as an argument, we should also have to admit that since

Exta: intestina. Virgilius 'lancibus et pandis fumantia reddimus exta'
is only an Abolita-gloss with a citation added, it must be attributed to a fuller Abolita ('Abolita').

(b) An item which, except for the quotation, appears in one of the glossaries derived from Abstrusa may itself be 'Abstrusa'; yet, not only should the interpretation be something more than an obvious explanation, but the whole item should have some relation to Virgil. It has also to be remembered that 'Abolita' as well as 'Abstrusa' was a source of these derivative glossaries.

(c) A quotation-item which resembles an extant Virgil-scholium can be safely referred to 'Abstrusa'. We may not have much confidence in the relation between item No. 228 and the comment of Servius on Aen. 1, 632; but such instances take on a different complexion when we consider the relation between No. 171 and the note of Servius Danielis at Aen. 1, 233.

Now we may turn to two negative propositions.

(a) That a lemma-word occurs in Virgil only once (if at all) gives us no basis for asserting that the item could not have come from a Virgil-scholium (see Nos. 106, 163 for good examples).

(b) Too much stress must not be laid on the actual form of the lemma. It should be obvious that as these items were passed from scholia to 'Abstrusa' and from 'Abstrusa' to Lib. (or, to avoid assuming the fact we wish to prove, let us say as these

items were being arranged into stricter alphabetical order at every single transcription), there would be a tendency to ensure greater usefulness for the glossary by giving to the lemma-words one of the more common forms. Oblique cases would be turned into the nominative, and verbs would be transformed into the third person singular of the present indicative or into the infinitive. From normal forms no inference whatever can be drawn about the origin of a gloss.

As regards unusual forms which are found in the lemma-words, we must distinguish two separate cases: those in which there may be some influence of the following quotation and those in which there does not seem to be any such influence. For a clear case of such influence see No. 219 and compare Nos. 113 and 156. Those lemma-words of unusual form which cannot fairly be attributed to the influence of the citation can alone be used by themselves to support a theory of the origin of these quotation-items (cf. Nos. 32 and 112).

15. GROUPS OF ITEMS. If the quotation items came from a *Citatenglossar* it might quite well happen that they would all have a family resemblance to one another, just as a series of month-name glosses in *Lib.* exhibit a common formula.¹ A glance suffices to show that one-third of the quotation-items in *Lib.* could be brought under a very simple formula; and little ingenuity is needed to divide all the items up under a few heads. The next few pages will be devoted to a discussion of the groups into which the items can be divided. The reader is referred by numbers to the items as they are printed in Part II.

Group Ia. Into this group fall 180 items with the following simple formula:—*Lemma, short interpretation, name of author, quotation.* Of these items, 110 present citations from Virgil, 30 from Lucan, 16 from Statius, and the remainder from Plautus, Terence, Sallust, Cicero, Persius, Quintilian, Juvenal, and Donatus. The items are short and we may ask: why should they be anything beyond mere marginal annotations remodelled for a glossary? Is it not pretentious to speak of *scholia* in connexion with trivial items like these? Yet from §13 we see that the simplicity of an item gives no valid indication of its source; the

¹ See my article 'De Mensium Nominibus', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XLIII p. 102 ff.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

notes to Nos. 230, and 246 show that even a short Virgil-gloss may come from scholia rather than from marginal notes; and though in short Virgil-items similarities with extant scholia cannot carry full conviction, attention is drawn to the notes on Nos. 212, 228, and 236. Furthermore, the fact that citations from Plautus, Terence, and other authors are so few in this group is against the supposition that texts of these authors were used as a direct quarry by the compiler of a glossary; from Nos. 108, 131, and 171 it is clear that some of the non-Virgilian citations are certainly from Virgil-scholia; and finally, the presence of Donatus-citations points very definitely to the use of Virgil-scholia. The homogeneity of this group then cannot be explained on the ground that some one compiled a glossary from marginal notes in the texts of authors. If, indeed, the homogeneity is not fictitious it is more probably due to the fact that Virgil-scholia were used as the basis of a glossary (that is of 'Abstrusa'), and that the compiler reduced to the simplest form the quotations which he found in the scholia he was using.

Group Ib. Twelve items differ from those included in Group Ia only by the omission of the author's name and call for no separate comment. No. 49 will serve as an example.

Group Ic. The twenty items of this group are still more defective. After the lemma we find only the author's name and a citation. Truly the compiler of a *Citatenglossar* might at times merely give an example of the usage of a word without explanation. But when we find that No. 214 is preceded in Lib. by 'Gangaridum: fluvius Armeniae' it is difficult to resist the suggestion that the two items should be combined (cf. §13). Again, No. 217 combined with Lib. CA 584 is strongly parallel to a Servian scholium. Finally, the presence of Donatus-citations (e.g. Nos. 18 and 21) must be regarded as strong proof that Virgil-scholia have been broken up to form some of the items in this group.

Group Id. Half a dozen items show only a lemma and a citation. Notice that No. 31 can be correlated happily with a neighbouring gloss.

Group Ie. Twelve items have the same kind of formula as those in groups Ia and Ib, but in place of the interpretation we find a brief grammatical note. Nos. 28, 99, 127, and 130 are all parallel to Servius or Servius Danielis.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Group If. Fifteen items (e.g. No. 46) give not only a short interpretation of the lemma but a short grammatical note as well. Marginal notes may of course have included grammatical and interpretative comments on the same word, but probability is rather in favor of regarding such items as these as fragments of scholia.

Group Ig. Forty-five items differ from those in group Ia by the length of the interpretations; and there is little room for doubt that Virgil-scholia are the quarry from which most, if not all, of them came. In the case of Virgil-citations, Nos. 223 and 225 are quite of a scholia nature and to think of them as the outcome of mere marginal notes is ridiculous. The presence of Donatus items (e.g. Nos. 17 and 22) will not therefore be surprising, and the passing mention of Lucretius (No. 98) in such an item is indubitably derived from a Virgil-scholium. When one compares Nos. 14, 106, 173, and 176 with extant scholia, it will be realized how rich a quarry the Liber Glossarum may be, if only sufficient patience is bestowed by enthusiasts and objectors alike in the tracking down of lost fragments of the predecessors of Servius.

16. GROUP IIa. This second group differs generally from the preceding Group I, by the fact that the quotations are not bluntly introduced but are prefaced by such words or phrases as: *apud, ut, sicut apud, unde et, ut est illud*. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that a glossary-compiler, going through the marginal notes in his copy of Virgil, might have remodelled the information he obtained by the use of such words and phrases; but it will readily be conceded that such phrases of themselves point rather to a scholiast, especially when we find references to non-Virgilian authors (e.g. No. 124). In Group IIa there are fifteen items in which the author's name is given. Nos. 124 and 187 are definitely parallel to Servius, and Nos. 198 and 239 almost declare themselves to be scholia.

Group IIb. The fifty items of this subdivision do not give the name of the author from whom the quotation is taken. Here again we are on firm ground; and there can be no doubt that many of these items could have come only from Virgil-scholia. Nos. 8, 10, 163, 190, 211, 232, 241, and 243 are parallel to Servius.

Group IIc. Ten items introduce the quotation by the words *de qua* or *de quibus*. No. 34 almost certainly appeared originally as a scholium.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Group IIId. Four items (e.g. No. 258) indicate by their phraseology the context from which the quotations came.

17. GROUP III. Twenty-two items contain not one but two or three quotations (often from different authors). Who will believe that any marginal notes have been the quarry for these items, or that any compiler indulged in personal research to the extent of combining a number of citations to illustrate a simple word? And who will deny that Virgil-scholia were the source? If anything can be deduced from a consideration of these various groups of items, it must be admitted that the mere form of the items in this third group decisively points to scholia. Notice how Nos. 115, 182, 201, 227, and 233 can be easily paralleled from Servius. Notice how the Sallust-quotation of No. 125 is found elsewhere only in Servius. Notice how Servius gives us the clue to the Cicero-quotation which has fallen out of No. 255. Notice how Plautus Bacch. 50 and Pseud. 218 are quoted in such a way that we cannot believe them to have come directly from a text of the author. Notice how No. 224 and a passage of Isidore had a common source, and how that source was attacked by Servius (or one of his predecessors).

18. GROUP IV. Here sixty items are included in which the lemma is itself the only quotation.¹ There is no cogent reason for excluding them from our survey. If it be true that Virgil-scholia were broken up for 'Abstrusa', it might frequently happen that the mere disintegration of a scholium would result in such items. Of course, on *a priori* grounds, it is possible that such items might be nothing more than a line taken from a text of an author with the marginal note added; and in the case of items where the lemma is a Virgilian phrase we certainly must remember that one source of Lib. was a series of Virgilian glosses (sometimes not definitely labelled as 'Virgili'). Yet Cicero (Pro Marcello 9, 27) is quoted with precisely the same word omitted as in extant scholia; and could the Ennius-item (No. 26) or the Livy-item (No. 35a) have come from texts of those authors?

19. GROUP V. There are twelve items which have no lemma of their own, but are found fused with a preceding Isidore-item. We cannot explain them merely on the ground that Lib. used an

¹ In some items of the other groups the lemma is a citation, but not the only one.

'interpolated' text of the *Etymologiae*; for some of the additions are joined to items from the *Differentiae*. Nor could we hastily supply the additions with lemma-words and disperse the items thus fabricated among the other groups; for Isidore used *Virgil-scholia* and there is a possibility that the whole of some of these items (including the 'Isidore' part) really came from *Virgil-scholia* to *Lib.* by way of 'Abstrusa' (cf. §52).¹ That six of these items are labelled 'Esidori' in *Lib.* may be explained on the ground that the compiler of *Lib.*, having two similar items (one *De Glis*, the other *Isidore*), adopted the longer one but ascribed it to *Isidore* as the more definite source. Note especially No. 208.

20. GROUP VI. Fourteen long items are either parallel to grammatical works like that of *Caper*, or are of a similar nature.² Whatever their source, it was not a *Citatenglossar* or marginal notes (cf. §51).

21. GROUP VII. In the fifth volume of *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, Goetz printed, under the title of 'Placidus Libri Glossarum', a number of items containing quotations which are not found in the Roman MSS. of *Placidus*. He was misled by the belief that a marginal label in *Lib.* applied to all the following glosses until another label appeared in the margin. That hypothesis is unsound; and in the preceding groups we tacitly included a number of these pseudo-*Placidus* items when *Lib.* does not label them definitely as 'Placidi' and when they are not found in the Roman MSS. In this present group are thirteen more of these items: (1) those which are labelled by *Lib.* as 'Placidi', but are not in the Roman MSS. and (2) those (labelled or unlabelled), of which only a part is to be found in the MSS. of *Placidus*. Now in some items of the Roman MSS. of *Placidus* there are quotations (e.g. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* V 9, 17; 9, 18; 27, 2; and 40, 5). Evidently those quotation-items of which some part appears in the Roman MSS. may indeed be fuller versions of the *Placidus*-items (cf. No. 32 below). At the same time, there is some relation between the glosses of the Roman MSS. of *Placidus* and *Virgil-scholia* (though it is not yet properly investigated), and *Virgil-scholia*

¹ Yet MU 289 (= *Isid. Etym.* 16, 3, 3 + *Abolita* 121, 19) shows that separate items were sometimes fused in *Lib.*

² Since *Lib. AS* 92, *AT* 109 and *TU* 133 may be from Isidore's lost work on grammar, they do not fall within our survey.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

still remain a possible source of the items we are considering.¹ Of those items which are not in the Roman MSS., but are labelled by Lib. as 'Placidi', it should be pointed out that the label 'Placidi' is frequently confused with the label 'De Glis',² and to attribute these items to Placidus on the evidence of the label alone is unsatisfactory, especially in the case of Nos. 19, 164, 168, and 210.

22. GROUP VIII. Nine citation-items of the PP-glossary (e.g. No. 129) which are not found in Lib. do not form a real class by themselves but can at once be distributed among the groups already surveyed.

23. RESULTS OF THE GROUPING. In most of the groups we have found items which have a definite connexion with extant scholia or which cannot be fairly attributed to marginal notes or to a *Citatenglossar*. The only serious doubt which has arisen is in connexion with the right of items to be included in our survey; yet if a critic holds that the so-called Placidus-items should not be included, the theory proposed is not affected one way or another. It is also obvious that the grouping of the items according to formula and contents has not shown any line of demarcation between the various sets. All that could be said is that some groups can be claimed as wholes more easily for 'Abstrusa' than others; but that in most groups there are items which are almost certainly 'Abstrusa'. So far then this grouping does nothing to weaken the theory proposed; but it does illustrate the weaknesses of the theories of Goetz and Wessner.

24. THE ITEMS REGARDED AUTHOR BY AUTHOR. If we cannot satisfactorily distinguish sets of items by means of their formula and general contents, may it not be possible to recognize that the quotations from one author have come from one source and citations of another author from a second source and by a different channel?

25. CATULLUS. The presence of only two items from this author indicates that marginal notes in a text can scarcely be the source; and the very nature of the interpretations is against such a supposition. There is indeed no close parallel between these items and any extant scholia though a comparison of No.

¹ Notice that the Placidus item Corp. Gloss. Lat. V 12, 2 = Abstrusa 30, 13.

² Probably because the original label in full was 'De Glossis Placidi'.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

2 with a passage of Isidore is suggestive. But in both cases the passage of Virgil where the Catullus-lines might have been cited is clearly demonstrated, and there can be no reasonable doubt that these two items have reached Lib. from Virgil-scholia by way of 'Abstrusa'.

26. CICERO. Of the fourteen Cicero-citations, five (Nos. 4, 6, 9, 10, and 14) are significantly parallel to extant scholia; one (No. 12) has for its lemma a Virgilian phrase; one (No. 8) is quoted by Servius and by Servius Danielis; and one (No. 5) is parallel to a passage of Agroecius. All these eight items have almost certainly come from Virgil-scholia. Of the remaining six, No. 3 is cited also by Aulus Gellius; No. 7 is the best-known phrase of Cicero and certainly need not have been obtained from a marginal note; Nos. 11 and 13 are possibly from Virgil-scholia. No. 15 has demonstrably not come direct from a text of Cicero and No. 16 is in any case puzzling. The item which originally contained a citation from the *Pro Sestio* (No. 255) clearly had its origin in Virgil-scholia. So far from there being any evidence that these items originated in marginal notes used by some unknown glossary-compiler, more than half of them have very definite claims to be fragments of Virgil-scholia, and that same source is the most natural place from which the remaining items could have been derived.

27. DONATUS. Since there is no hint that the commentary on Terence was the source of these items, all of these eight items must have come from a Virgil-commentary or a set of Virgil-scholia.¹ Three of the items (No. 17, 18, 19) are from the *Vita Virgili*, and it seems that the compiler of 'Abstrusa' has remodelled marginal annotations on that little work. The other items fall naturally into their places in the commentary of Donatus on Virgil; but it is fairly evident that the commentary or scholia, which the compiler of 'Abstrusa' used, were based on Donatus and were not merely the work of Donatus in its original form.

28. DRACONTIUS. See note to item No. 25.

29. ENNIUS. Of these two items, No. 26 is possibly a fragment of a longer 'Abstrusa'-item, while No. 27 is definitely connected with extant Virgilian scholia and learned comment.

¹ Cf. also §44.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

30. HORACE. This author is cited in six items. Of these No. 28 is parallel to an extant scholium; No. 30 is definitely of a scholium nature. Nos. 29 and 31 are easily related to Virgilian contexts while No. 32 may be a genuine Placidus-gloss. The citation in No. 27 certainly did not come directly from a text of Horace. There is no ground for deriving these items from marginal notes in a text of Horace, and the paucity of citations alone would suffice to discredit such a view.

31. JUVENAL. Nos. 33 and 34 are quite easily associated with Virgilian contexts and the remaining item (No. 35) is certainly not derived from a marginal note to the author. It is impossible to resist the conclusion that these few items have reached Lib. from Virgil-scholia. For the solitary citation from LIVY see the note to item No. 35a.

32. LUCAN. In dealing with the citations from this author we should notice two important points. First, the extant scholia on Lucan are themselves indebted to pre-existing Virgil-scholia; and consequently, when one of our items is parallel to a Lucan-scholium, we should remember that the Lucan-scholium may have a basis in Virgil-scholia, and that the task of deciding whether the citation came to Lib. from the Lucan-scholium or from Virgil-scholia is unusually delicate. Virgil-scholia, not Lucan-scholia, were the depository and storehouse of learning; and if we try to connect an item with Lucan-scholia the grounds must be somewhat more definite than they need be in the case of an attribution to Virgil-scholia. The second point to be noticed counterbalances the former. Ingenuity will often outlive sane judgment in connecting an item with Virgil-scholia, especially if we set out with the intention of proving that connexion. From the extant scholia on Virgil, it is clear that no topic and no word in the Latin language can safely be excluded from the purview of a Virgilian commentator. No one can demonstrate that some of these items did not come from lost Virgil-scholia; nor can any one demonstrate that they did. In this work of literary archaeology among the medieval scrap-heaps we must sometimes be satisfied with probabilities.

Among these items from Lucan there are many about which no decision is possible (e.g. Nos. 46, 48, 49, 52, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65); they could have come from Virgil-scholia; yet if the use of Lucan-

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

scholia were otherwise to be proved, they might equally well be attributed to that source. Some items, however, (e.g. Nos. 41, 42, 43, 45, 55, 67, 68) are parallel to extant Virgil-scholia or to passages of Isidore or to shorter glosses preserved in *Abstrusa*; and it is fairly probable that they at least have come from Virgil-scholia rather than from a Lucan-commentary. Others again, from internal evidence, or from a consideration of parallel and cognate glosses, can be associated more easily with Virgil-scholia than with Lucan-scholia (e.g. Nos. 37, 57, 72, 74). Others can be connected, without any manipulation for the purpose of proving a theory, with suitable Virgilian contexts (e.g. Nos. 36, 38, 39, 40, 54, 71, 78, 82, 93). So far then it is evident that Virgil-scholia are almost certainly the source of some Lucan-items and possibly the source of others.

Is there any evidence that some items had Lucan-scholia as their original source? A few of them have non-Virgilian lemma-words or phrases; but that in itself is not a fact to be pressed too far, since the citations sometimes seem to have influenced the lemma. The claim of Nos. 55, 61, 70, 73, 83, 89 to have come from Lucan-scholia would be even stronger than it is if No. 55 had not a parallel in Servius and No. 61 a parallel in Isidore; for these two items warn us that a conclusion drawn from the superficial evidence of a citation-item may be wrong. Again, a few more items are, as they stand, more appropriate to the Lucan-passage cited than to any Virgilian context (e.g. 44, 79, 84, 85, 92). Yet even this is not decisive evidence, since a Virgil-scholiast often cited another author because he afforded, not a parallel, but a contrast (cf. note to No. 44). A case can certainly be made out for the use of Lucan-scholia; but it is not overwhelming, nor does it mean that all the Lucan-citations must have come from such Lucan-scholia.

There is no clear line of cleavage between items which may have come from Lucan-scholia and those which may have come from Virgil-scholia, and items of both categories are also to be found in PP. Even if Lucan-scholia were a source of some of these items, it would still be possible to hold that they came from 'Abstrusa' whose compiler may have had access to a set of Lucan-scholia. The items certainly come from a common source of Lib. and PP, and that common source is the *De Glis* material;

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

and of the De Gl's material it is only 'Abstrusa' which makes any extensive use of citations. Furthermore, evidence is not lacking that 'Abstrusa' did indeed draw upon Lucan-scholia.¹

33. LUCILIUS. Of the five items Nos. 27, 96, 97 are probably derived from Virgil-scholia and No. 94 is easily connected with a suitable context. No. 95 alone cannot immediately be connected with a Virgilian context; yet that fact does not preclude the possibility that it ultimately comes from a Virgil-scholium. Since the number of items is few, and since it is not likely that any glossary-compiler would be the fortunate possessor of a full text of the author, we have no hesitation in declaring that the Lucilius-citations of Lib. are derived from Virgil-scholia.

34. LUCRETIUS. Of these three items No. 99 is strikingly parallel to Servius; No. 98 would form a splendid supplement to a Servian scholium; and No. 100 is easily associated with a Virgilian context.

35. MARTIAL. Who will venture to suggest that this single item is derived from a marginal note in a text of Martial, especially when it is possible to indicate the appropriate line of Virgil where a scholiast could have cited the passage?

36. OVID. Of this author there are only three items in Lib. They can all be easily associated with suitable Virgilian contexts, and No. 104 is probably part of a long and valuable scholium.

37. PERSIUS. Of these three items No. 106 is strikingly parallel to Servius, while the other two read like scholia.

38. PLAUTUS. Of the thirteen citations from this author, Nos. 108, 110, 111, and 115 are parallel to extant scholia, and their origin is not in the least doubt. Furthermore Nos. 109, 112, 116, 118, 119, and 120 give internal evidence of an origin in Virgil-scholia. Nos. 113 and 117 are easily connected with a Virgilian context, and the remaining item (No. 114) may perhaps be a Placidus-gloss. There is not a grain of evidence for supposing that any of these items is a remodelled version of marginal notes in a Plautine text.

¹ E. g. Abstr. 42, 36 = Schol. Luc. 1, 426; and cf. Laistner, Class. Quart. 18, 52.

39. QUINTILIAN. These three items are remarkable. None of the lemma-words is Virgilian, and all the citations are from a remarkably circumscribed part of the author. We cannot say that Lib. had access to a few odd pages of Quintilian; for No. 121 appears also in PP. Furthermore, two of the items are labelled De Glis. As we have seen, that label is likely to refer to 'Abstrusa' when a citation-gloss is in question; but it is not easy to suppose that the compiler of 'Abstrusa' had a MS. of Quintilian annotated only at this place. Again the curious substitution of 'Cicero' for the name of the author in No. 123 implies that the item did not start its career in a text of the author. May not some Virgil-scholiast have quoted this passage of Quintilian? And may not the compiler of 'Abstrusa' have made use of marginal annotations to the scholium or have invented them?

40. SALLUST. Of these ten items no fewer than eight are parallel to extant scholia, while Nos. 132 and 133 quote fragments of Sallust which are otherwise unknown. That the Sallust-items came from Virgil-scholia there is not the slightest possible doubt.

41. SOLINUS. See note to No. 134.

42. STATIUS. (a) Of the three Achilleis-items No. 137 is possibly, No. 135 probably, and No. 136 certainly derived from Virgil-scholia.

(b) It is remarkable that all the citations of the Thebais are taken between 9, 349 and 12, 75. Does not that imply that these items originated in a text of Statius, either because the MS. used only contained those four books or because marginal annotations were only found in that area? Again, the lemma-words and phrases of Nos. 138, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, and 159 are non-Virgilian. It is possible to connect all these items with Virgilian contexts; but, in view of the curious circumscription of the items to four books, it would be difficult to prove that the source of some at least of these Thebais-items was not Statius-scholia or a Statius-commentary.¹ Furthermore, No. 147 gives us a longer citation of Statius than can be paralleled in extant Virgil-scholia; and the natural inference (in spite of a possible

¹ Note that the Statius-citations are not circumscribed as strikingly as the citations of Quintilian; and arguments which may fairly be adduced in the one case are not at all cogent in the other.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

claim for origin in Virgil-scholia) is that the item comes from a text of the author. Against this we can only say that Nos. 144 and 145 are possibly derived from Virgil-scholia while Nos. 142 and 148 are perhaps more likely to have come from Virgil-scholia than from a Statius-commentary. On the whole then it is possible that many of these items came rather from Statius-marginalia or scholia than from Virgil-scholia, though individual items may be derived from the latter source. It is noteworthy that of all these items only one (No. 152) is at all parallel to the Statius-scholia of Lactantius Placidus.¹

Since some of these items which cannot be definitely derived from Virgil-scholia appear in PP also, and since some are labelled *De Glis in Lib.*, we must, as in the case of Lucan, consider whether, after all, the items may have come from 'Abstrusa', whose compiler may have had access to a set of Statius-glosses or an annotated text of Statius.²

43. SULPICIUS SEVERUS. See notes to Nos. 161 and 162.

44. TERENCE. Of these items Nos. 164, 173, 175, 176 (and perhaps 177) are shown by their lemma-words to have come from scholia on the text of Virgil and not from Terence-scholia. Nos. 163 and 171 are strikingly parallel to Virgil-scholia and have no similarity to Terence-scholia; and No. 96 certainly did not take its origin in a marginal note or scholium on the text of Terence. No. 168 is nearer to a passage of Isidore (derived from Virgil-scholia?) than to the extant Terence-scholia. Nos. 166 and 169 have non-Virgilian lemma-words but are not paralleled by Terence-scholia, and like Nos. 165, 170, 174, 177, and 178 cannot be said to afford any evidence for the origin of these Terence citation-glosses. Indeed it is only in the case of No. 172 that Terence-scholia parallel one of these items in any striking way; and even in that case it is possible to hold that the item really came from a Virgil-scholium.³ In short, of the items which may be held to afford evidence of their ultimate source, at least six are indubitably derived from Virgil-scholia and only one could fairly be claimed for Terence-scholia. It is difficult to believe

¹Edited by R. Jahnke, 1898.

²The presence of items in the extant *Abstrusa* derived from Statius has not yet been investigated.

³This is not the place to discuss fully the relation of Terence-scholia to Virgil-scholia; but attention is drawn to the notes on item No. 164, where such a relation is very evident.

that one item came from one source while six came from a source which, in the case of other authors, has proved to be fruitful; and, since even No. 172 could have come from Virgil-scholia, the clear inference is that all these Terence citation-glosses came probably from Virgil-scholia and none of them from Terence-scholia. For possible relations of Terence-items to *Abolita* see §50.

45. TROGUS. This item is almost surely from a Virgil-scholium.

46. VARRO. Of these four items Nos. 181 and 182 are parallel to extant scholia; No. 183 (if it is a genuine citation-item) came from a scholium, and No. 180 can easily be claimed for the same source. Taken in conjunction with the other items of Lib. where Varro is mentioned by name, we cannot have any doubt that these four items are derived from Virgil-scholia.

47. VIRGIL. Who will undertake to distinguish between a marginal note in a Virgil MS. and a short scholium? Nos. 185, 198, 207, 211, for example, are certainly from scholia; and even a trivial item like No. 217 may come from the same source. The frequent label *De Glis* shows that these citation-items are different from the marginal notes which Lib. remodelled and labelled as 'Virgili' and probability points to 'Abstrusa' as the source. For Virgil citations in 'Abolita' see §50.

48. SACRED SCRIPTURE. Only two specimens are here printed.¹ No. 248 is quite possibly from a Virgil-scholium (cf. No. 96), and No. 249 is a Biblical item of 'Abstrusa'.²

49. Viewing the items author by author, it becomes clear from the number of passages cited from each, from the internal evidence of the items, and from a comparison with cognate glosses that Virgil-scholia were the source of the majority. And since 'Abstrusa' was the channel through which Virgil-scholia were most likely to reach Lib. and PP, these items are to be regarded as glosses of 'Abstrusa'. There are only two important exceptions to be made: some of the Lucan-citations and some of those

¹Others will be found in Lib. at:—AN 428; EF 176; FE 176; GR 202; LO 175; MA 527; ME 151; MI 325; MU 278; NA 72; PE 1254; PR 1908, 2703; RE 1588; RU 92; SA 145; SI 181, 608. Some may be unrecognized Patristic excerpts; the remainder could quite well be claimed for 'Abstrusa' (cf. §9).

²Notice the Biblical citation at Abstr. 92, 33.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

from the *Thebais* of Statius are possibly not derived from Virgil-scholia, though their claim to be 'Abstrusa' glosses is not entirely invalidated (cf. §§ 32, 42).

50. POSSIBLE 'ABOLITA'-ITEMS. Among the sources of *Abolita* are *Festus*-glosses and short glosses from *Virgil* and *Terence* MSS. It is possible then, that before 'Abolita' was epitomized and fused with an epitomized 'Abstrusa' (as it is now in *Vat. a*) it still retained (through the medium of *Festus*) passages cited by *Verrius Flaccus*; but Nos. 117 and 257 are the only possible instances among our items. Sometimes too 'Abolita' might have cited a *Virgilian* line along with the marginal note; but No. 206 is the only sure instance, and in any case only the simplest items could come from this source. Similarly, lines of *Terence* might have been cited; but only Nos. 166, 169, 170, and 178 have even the faintest claim to be 'Abolita'. The parallels between Nos. 11, 49, 56, 140, 192 and *Abolita* are too slight to be conclusive.

'Abolita' was not so likely to contain citations as 'Abstrusa'; for it made no use of scholia, and only a half-hearted use of *Festus*. Further, there is little evidence for attributing many citation-glosses to it. We may then regard 'Abolita' as only a very secondary source of quotation-items.

51. RELATION OF LIB. TO CAPER AND OTHERS. Nos. 5, 27, 96, 182, 183, 216, and 234, for example, are very similar to passages in extant grammatical works such as those of *Caper*, *Agroecius*, and *Audax*. These works were not a source of *Lib.* in the same sense as the *Etymologiae* of *Isidore* were a source, and it is doubtful whether the items mentioned are taken directly from such works. *Servius* cites *Caper* (e.g. at *Aen.* 6, 545); the *Berne-scholia* cite *Agroecius* (e.g. at *Ecl.* 5, 80); and there are parallels between *Isidore*, *Servius*, *Caper*, and *Agroecius* (cf. No. 5). A variorum-commentary therefore may have used *Caper* and other grammatical writers, and our items may thus have reached *Lib.* by way of 'Abstrusa'. If the label at No. 183 is correct we have evidence for this view.¹ A few items (e.g. No. 34) are paralleled or supplemented by glosses found in the

¹In marginal labels *Caper* is not mentioned, *Priscian* only once, and *Audax* very rarely. Even these few labels may be due to explanations in 'Abstrusa' such as 'ut scribit *Audax*'. Conversely, *Lib.* sometimes converts a label into an introductory phrase (cf. No. 34 below).

treatise *De Dubiis Nominibus* (Gramm. Lat. V 571-594). Side by side with much later material this treatise (compiled later than Isidore) retains fragments of Caper and other grammatical treatises; but whether it obtained its valuable glosses from such treatises or from Virgil-scholia is not clear. The few coincidences (interesting but never close, cf. item No. 34) between it and Lib. are probably due to the fact that the items have come from the same ultimate source by very diverse channels. They certainly afford no proof that Lib. and PP made use of a *Citatenglossar*.

52. RELATION OF ISIDORE AND LIB. ITEMS. We know that Isidore used Virgil-scholia; we suspect that 'Abstrusa' provided Lib. with items from Virgil-scholia; and Nos. 4, 43, 175, 202, 212, 231, for example, are closely parallel to passages of Isidore (but are quite certainly not excerpts from him). We therefore may infer that these (at least) are cases where Isidore and Lib. are drawing independently on Virgil-scholia. The inference is strengthened by Nos. 42 and 243 which are parallel not only to Isidore but to extant scholia and by Nos. 41 and 61 which are parallel to Isidore and Abstrusa.

Consequently a parallelism between Isidore and Lib. items is presumptive proof of origin in Virgil-scholia. Lib. helps us to trace Isidore's sources; Isidore helps us to re-combine the scattered fragments of scholia in Lib. (cf. No. 4).

53. NATURE OF THE SCHOLIA USED BY 'ABSTRUSA'. These scholia were of the variorum-type (cf. Nos. 22, 198, 199); they contained material sometimes parallel to Servius (cf. Nos. 28, 106), sometimes to the Berne-scholia (cf. Nos. 189, 219), sometimes to Philargyrius (cf. No. 185), sometimes to pre-Servian comment (cf. Nos. 4, 224) and sometimes of undoubtedly Donatian origin (cf. Nos. 20-24, 198). They were compiled by a Christian (cf. Nos. 96, 231, and 248) probably outside Italy (cf. Nos. 15, 30, 187).¹ They were prefaced by Donatus' life of Virgil (cf. Nos. 17, 18, 19). The fact that the scholia themselves presumably were annotated (cf. Nos. 19, 26, 72) does not necessarily prove that they were in a separate volume rather than in the margin of a Virgil-text.

¹Adamnan, abbot of Iona, has been suggested as the author of this variorum-commentary; but the evidence for his supposed authorship is admittedly weak (cf. Thomson in *Journ. of Philology* 35, 263; Wessner, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 1, 373).

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

54. RECOVERY OF SCHOLIA. From §13 it is clear that in Lib. Virgil-scholia are dismembered and dispersed, and from §52 we see that Isidore gives us hints towards their reconstruction. No apology therefore is needed for some tentative reconstructions in the notes to some of the items (cf. Nos. 35a, 195, 205, 221 for examples).

55. RECOVERY OF LITERARY FRAGMENTS. To §18 there is a very important corollary. If items which have a quotation for their lemma have come from scholia, may not some lemma-words of Lib. be fragments of quotations (even if we do not immediately recognize them as such)? Certainly few will deny that Baehrens' attribution of No. 94 to Lucilius affords justification for including Nos. 250, 251, 253. Though the recovery of lost fragments is not the main object of this treatise, it will not be out of place to offer a word of warning. It must not be thought that every strange word is a fragment of Republican Latin. What an opportunity would be afforded for the spinning of theories by 'Parcissi: servaricibus; a parcendo servandoque dictum'! Yet the lemma is not a piece of old Latin: it is a corruption of a scholium on Geo. 1, 4 which appears in Servius as 'Parcis autem servatricibus frugi, quae mella custodiunt.'¹

¹ Lemma-words which are possibly citation fragments will be found in Lib. at: AQ 12; CL 201; CO 99, 609, 1155, 1307, 1308; FA 99; IN 504, 1793, 1987; LE 157; LU 76, 77, 428; MA 426, 914; ME 451; NA 164; NI 130; NU 93; PL 355; PO 45, 519, 532; SC 113, 114; SE 255, 256; SP 153; ST 151. Other glossaries which have not generally preserved the citations transmitted through 'Abstrusa' may, however, retain similar fragments in their lemma-words. In this connection attention is called to the following items of the Abavus-glossary (C. G. L. IV pp. 301-403): 307, 14; 315, 33; 316, 8; 333, 48; 343, 40; 389, 13; 390, 28; 393, 40.

PART II

PART II: THE QUOTATION-GLOSSES

IN this part are printed all the important citation-items.¹ The text is based on two MSS., Vat. Pal. Lat. 1773 (L) and Paris 11529-30 (P), and my aim has been rather to recover the readings of the archetype than to emend every doubtful word or gloss. In order to illustrate the manuscript tradition of Lib., many of the more important items show a full collation of the Milan (A), Cambrai (C), Tours (T), and Vendôme (V) MSS. Occasional readings of the Bamberg (B), London (D), Berne (F), and Vercelli (W) MSS. are cited.² The Paris-fragment of the PP-glossary, discovered by Gundermann and printed by Goetz (in *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* V pp. 104-158), is referred to as G. To each item are appended, first a reference to its numeration in the edition of Lib. and then the marginal label given by the MSS. The following abbreviations are used:—

ASL	=	Adnotationes super Lucanum (ed. J. Endt, 1909)
BS	=	Scholia Bernensia ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica (ed. Hagen, Leipzig, 1867; reprinted from <i>Jahrbücher für Class. Phil.</i> , Supp. 4, 1867 p. 749 ff.)
CBL	=	M. Annaei Lucani Commenta Bernensia (ed. H. Usener, 1869)

¹ I omit: (a) a number of Biblical items (but cf. Part I §48); (b) a number of unidentified citations of no apparent value which will be found in Lib. at:— BR 15; CU 15; ER 32; IU 80; NO 31; PE 1119; SE 103, 449, 651; SU 30; (c) many short Virgilian items (but some are printed by Thomson, St. Andrews University Publ. xiii, and a full set of references is given in the Appendix to the present volume).

² The age and relative values of these MSS. are briefly discussed in the preface to the edition of Lib. It suffices to state here that one family consists of P (9th. cent.), C (9th. cent.), and F (9th. cent.); a second family consists of L (9th. cent.), A (9th. cent.), and B (11th. cent.); T (9th. cent.) and V (11th. cent.) are derived from an emended Tours-MS. of the early 9th. cent.; D is a 10th. cent. abbreviated version; and W (10th. cent.) is probably of the same family as LAB. Since the limitation of space made a curtailment of the apparatus criticus of the full edition of Lib. necessary, the readings of ACTVBDFW here given may be regarded as a supplement of some interest. When ACT and V are cited for anything more than a marginal label it should be understood that the whole item has been collated, though I have not always reported such variants as 'erba' or 'aerba,' for 'herba.' BDF and W are cited only for individual words. In the spelling of Virgil's name I have followed what seems to have been the varying practice of the archetype.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

DCT = Donati Commentum Terenti (ed. P. Wessner, 1902-1905)

Dub. Nom. = De Dubiis Nominibus (= Keil, Gramm. Lat. V 571-594)

Gloss. = the marginal labels 'De Glossis' and 'De Gl's' prefixed to certain items in Lib. These labels will be indicated by the same abbreviation in the edition of Lib.

Is. Et. = Isidori Etymologiae (ed. W. M. Lindsay, 1911)

Is. Diff. = Isidori Differentiae (ed. Arevalus; reprinted in Migne's Patrologia, vol. 83, pp. 10-98)

Serv. = Servii Grammatici in Vergili carmina commentarii (ed. G. Thilo, 1881-1887)

SD = Servius Danielis (i.e. the additions to Servius, first printed by Petrus Daniel in 1600, and now printed in italics in Thilo's edition of Serv.)

CATULLUS

Pumex: lapis spungiosus et aridus; unde et scriptores eum pro poliendis libris utuntur. Catul(l)us (1, 1) “cui dono lepidum novum libellum arido modo pumice expolitum?”. (PU 280. Isidori LVC; no label PT)

spongiosus PT pung- L sphung- C sphoniosus V; punice T; expolito PC expoliatum TV.

The label ‘Isidori’ is affixed to PU 280 (instead of PU 281) by an error of Lib. Isidore quotes the line in Et. 6, 12, 3; Serv. refers to it in his note on Aen. 12, 587 (latebroso in pumice).

Pinguis: crassus; nam obesus plus est quam pinguis. Catul(l)us ait (39, 11) “aut pinguis Umber aut obesus Etruscus”. (PI 152. Gloss. LPTVA; no label CWD)

grassus LPCA (not TVWD); nabobesus L nam obessus T; ait aut pinguis LPCAWD aut pro pinguis TV aut parcus MSS. and editors of Catullus; ubera aut obesus et grossus LPTVCAWD.

The reading ‘pinguis’ (for ‘parcus’ or ‘parthus’) in the line of Catullus is clearly fixed by the lemma and interpretation, and cannot therefore be attributed to a careless scribe. The reading is supported by the ‘pinguibus Umbris’ of Persius (3, 74) and was well defended by Lindsay in Class. Rev. 34, 105. Compare also Is. Diff. I 114 (....crassus pinguis est, obesus plus est quam pinguis) and Lib. OB 98^a: ‘Obesaque terga’ (Virg. Geo. 3, 80): distenta et quasi subfarcinata; quod forinsecus obesum est, quod intrinsecus crassum dicitur. All three items are closely related to one another and very probably all are fragments of a scholium on Geo. 3, 80.

CICERO

Deprecare (-ri): excusare vel expurgare. Cicero (Verr. II 2, 78, 192) “quid” inquit “faci(a)t (H)ortensius; avaritiaene crimina frugalitatis laudibus deprecetur?”. (DE 914. No label LPTVAWD)

inquit LPTD (not AV); ostensius TVAW (not LPD); avaritiae nec cr. L; fragilitatis LPTVAWD; deprecatur LPTVA.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

From a scholium either on Aen. 12, 931 (deprecor; cf. Aul. Gell. VI 16) or on some line where a distinction was drawn between ‘precor’, ‘deprecor’, and ‘oro’.

4 Fruges: generis feminini: “frugesque receptas” (Aen. 1, 178). sunt autem maiores; sunt et minores. *⟨minores⟩ fruges propriæ frumenta dicuntur; ea sunt quae aristas habent; fruges autem reliquæ.* unde Cicero (Verr. II 3, 7, 18) “vini et olei decumas et frugum minutarum”. frumenta autem vel fruges a fruendo, hoc est a vescendo, dictæ. (FR 256. No label LP)

fruges quae receptæ LP; veniet olei P.

This item came from a scholium on Aen. 1, 178 of which a parallel version is found in Is. Et. 17, 3, 2 (Frumenta sunt propriæ quae aristas habent; fruges autem reliqua. frumenta autem vel fruges a fruendo, hoc est a vescendo, dictæ; nam frumen dicitur summa pars gulæ. = Lib. FR 255). Serv. deliberately contradicts the distinction drawn by our item and Isidore (on Aen. 1, 178: fruges generaliter omnes fruges dicuntur, et errant qui discernunt frumenta a frugibus; nam Cicero ait ‘olei et frugum minutarum’ cum de leguminibus diceret ut ostenderet etiam frumenta fruges vocari; frugum autem nomen tractum est a frumine, id est eminente gutturis parte). Our item therefore brings us strikingly into contact with a pre-Servian commentator to whose opinions and whose use of the Cicero-citation Servius or one of his authorities objected.

Is. and Serv. justify us in regarding Lib. FR 278 (Frumen: summa pars gulæ qua fruimur cibis, id est qua vescimur) as another fragment of the scholium from which this item came.

5 Minores: esse res aliquas aut homines dicimus; nam ‘minoris em⟨p⟩tum’ aut ‘aestimatum’ quippiam recte scribimus. sicut et ‘pluris’ quod maiore summa taxatur; ‘plures’ vero de multitudine. ‘plures’ comparativi gradus est. Cicero (Verr. II 5, 26, 66) “unus plures praedonum duces ⟨vivos⟩ cepit Publius Servilius quam ceteri”. positivum habet ‘multum’, superlativum ‘plurimi’. (MI 109. No label LP)

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

nam minores LP (not Agroecius in Gramm. Lat. VII 116); maioris summa LP; multitudine scribimus plures Agroec.; comparativus Agroec.; ciceronus plures P; praed. cepit duces LP duces cepit Agroec.; LP omit Publius; quam omnes antea MSS. of Cicero (not LP or Agroec.); plurimum LP.

For the possible explanation of the relation between this item and Agroecius see Part I §51. Compare also Is. Diff. I 442 (pluris est quod maiore summa taxatur, plures vero de multitudine scribimus), which, like our item, may have come from a Virgil-scholium.

Cervix: dum singulari numero dicitur significat collum, dum plurali superbiam; ut Cicero in Verrem (II 5, 42, 110) "praetorem tu accuses? frange cervices", id est superbiam inclina. (CE 547. Gloss. LTVAW)

P¹ omits entirely (P² adds in margin). pluralibusque viam LAW pluri contumaciam TV (a reading derived from CE 549 i.e. Is. Et. 11, 1, 61); Varonem LP²A Varone TV; tuacussus LAW tua causas P² tu accusas TV (and inferior MSS. of Cicero); cervices frangere et superviam inclinare LTVA.

This item originated in a scholium on Aen. 2, 707 (Cervici imponere nostrae). Compare Serv. (cervix cum numero singulari dicitur collum significat; si plurali utamur, superbiam ostendimus, ut in Verrinis 'frange cervices'), a shorter version than our item. From the same scholium is derived Is. Et. 11, 1, 61 where we seem to have a still fuller version.

"Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?" (Cic. Cat. I, 1): quousque vel quamdiu male uteris, Catilina, patientia nostra? (QUO 143. No label LP)

Quoustandem L; Catilinam patientiam nostram LP (in both quotation and interpretation); male veteris L.

It would be absurd to say that this item could have come only from a marginal note in a text of Cicero. The item indeed reappears in the Abavus-glossary and quite possibly came to Lib. and Abavus from 'Abstrusa'. As we may see from Serv., Virgilian scholiasts sometimes added interpretations to their illustrative citations and our item may have originated in a scholium on Aen. 5, 384 (quo me decet usque teneri).

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

8 Obliviscor: oblivioni trador; hinc (Cic. Cael. 20, 50) “obliviscor iniurias tuas, Clodia”. (OB 225. No label LP. Reappears in PP)

Oplib- LP (thrice); oblibione PG; hinc G omits; inuas LP.

This passage of Cicero is cited by Serv. on Aen. 1, 203 (meminisse) and by SD on Aen. 2, 148 (obliviscere). Cf. also Gramm. Lat. VII 495, 25.

9 Ciceronis: (Marc. 9, 27) “quid enim est *⟨omnino⟩* hoc ipsum diu, in quo est aliquid extreum?”. (CI 35. No label LPTVAW)

Cicer obis LPTVAW; omnino LPTVAW, Serv., and Schol. Bob. omit; textrinum LPAW (not TV).

The Virgilian scholia cite this passage of Cicero at Aen. 10, 467 (Breve tempus vitae). The omission of ‘omnino’ in our item is strong evidence that we have here a fragment of a scholium parallel to Servius and the Bobbio-scholium.

10 Hospes: et qui peregrinum suscipit et qui suscipitur; sicut (Cic. Deiot. 3, 8) “quam *⟨regi Deiotaro⟩* hospes hospiti porrexiſti”. (HO 155. No label LP)

suscepit P (P² corrects); et suscipitur L (qui: added by L²).

From a scholium on Aen. 8, 532. Compare Serv. (Hospes: et qui suscipit et qui suscipitur hospes vocatur).

11 Tector: cautior. Cicero (Deiot. 6, 16) “quis tector, quis prudentior?”. (TE 24. No label LPTVC)

Tector LPTV Taector C.

Possibly from a scholium on Aen. 2, 126 (cf. SD: Tector: aut cautus ne intellegatur). On the possible relation between this item and the Abolita-gloss (Tector: cautus) see Part I §50.

12 “Dextra data” (Aen. 4, 307): fiduciam salutis fideique custodire promittit; Cicero (Phil. XI 2, 5) “dexteræ, quæ fidei testes esse solebant”. (DE 1355. No label LPVA)

T omits entirely. Dextra dicta A; dextra quæ fidei V; teste P; solent LPVA.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

This is a particularly clear case of a citation not having come directly from the text of the author; for the lemma shows that it was brought into relation with Aen. 4, 307 by a scholiast.

Is. Et. 11, 67 (.....ipsa fidei testis atque salutis adhibetur), though using a different citation from Cicero, is possibly derived from a similar scholium.

Perfugis: fugitivis. (Cic. Or. 223) “cur de perfugis nostris copias comparatis?”. (PE 729. No label LPTVCA)

Perfrugis LPCA (not TV); quur LPCA; perfrugiis PC profugiis LA; capias TVA; comparantes PTVCA comparantes L.

The lemma-word is not Virgilian; but the item may nevertheless be from a scholium on Aen. 1, 2 where Serv. discusses ‘profugus’ at length, citing Sallust and Lucan. In Abstrusa we have the item: Profugus: porro fugatus (=Serv.) vel fugitivus; but the slight similarity is not to be pressed.

Pale(a)ria: latitudo *⟨pellium; unde et palea quae⟩* collum ligat sive *⟨pars anuli⟩*; (Cic. Off. III 9, 38) “cum convertisset anuli paleam”. (PA 149. No label LP)

latitudo colligit sine cum LP; anulli paleam P; cum palam eius anuli ad palmam converterat MSS. and editors of Cicero (but ‘paleam’ in Berne MS. of Cic.).

Corrupt as this item is, we can see that the Cicero-citation is not taken directly from a text of the author. The reconstruction is fully justified by SD on Geo. 3, 53 (Palearia autem sunt pelles dependentes ex gutture. et aliter: unde et paleae quae collum amplectuntur. et ea pars anuli quae gemmam cohibet propter similitudinem palea dicitur; Cicero, De Officiis tertio ‘cum paleam eius anuli ad palman converteret, a nullo videbatur’).

Another part of the scholium from which this item comes is found at PA 133 (Palearia: guttura pendentia boum; Virgilius ‘et crurum tenus a mento palearia pendent’).

Rempublicam: id est rem populi; res enim publica dicitur apud Romanos quam nos rem patriam *⟨dicimus⟩*. idem rem populi esse negare non possumus; populum autem

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

non omnem coetum multitudinis dici sed coetum iuris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatum. (RE 1038. No label LP)

patriam id est rem LP (from: p. id ē r.); cetum P (twice); dicit sed P; communem sotiatum L.

Cicero, Rep. I 25, 39 wrote: est igitur, inquit Africanus, res publica res populi; populus autem non omnis hominum coetus quoquo modo congregatus, sed coetus multitudinis iuris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatus.

The latter part of our item is merely a recast of the words of Cicero who was cited by a scholiast at such a line as Aen. 1, 33 (Romanam condere gentem). The first part is possibly a separate item. If it is not, then the equivalence 'respublica = res patria' may afford a clue to the provenience of the scholia used by 'Abstrusa'.

16 Kauponem: tabernarium de quo Cicero (?) "cuius est nomen caupo". (KA 153. No label LPTV)

tavernarium LP (not TV); de co P; nomen ypoco P ycopo LTV.

I have not found the source of this citation. What proper name may the extraordinary readings of the MSS. represent?

DONATUS

17 Togam: advocationem iuridicam aliquotiens; de Virgilio namque sic quidam ait (Don. Vit. Verg. 48 Brummer) "togam est consecutus; egit causam non amplius quam unam". (TO 13. No label LPTV)

de TV omit; constitutus TV.

The words of Donatus as presented by the MSS. of the Vita Vergili are: egit et causam apud iudices unam omnino nec amplius quam semel (and so Philargyrius, reading 'non amplius'). There can be no doubt that our item is derived from a life of Virgil (of Donatian origin) prefixed to a commentary. Either there were marginal explanations of the life in the MSS. or the compiler of 'Abstrusa' is the author of the interpretation.

It is not clear how we should correlate this item with CU 303 (Curia: toga, id est advocatione iuridica).

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Lenociniis: Donatus (Vit. Verg. 95) “pronuntiabat autem cum suavitate, cum lenociniis miris”. (LE 138. No label LPT)

Lenociis T; aut cum T.

From this item it is clear that the life prefixed to the commentary used by the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ was definitely attributed to Donatus. The fact that item No. 17 uses the word ‘quidam’ is not sound evidence to the contrary.

Colon: neutrum est, ut (Don. Vit. Verg. 107) “vel quodlibet colon”. (CO 279. Placidi LPTVA)

quolibet P colibet L.

The ascription to Placidus is not supported by any item in the Roman MSS. of Placidus (cf. Part I §21). If the item comes from ‘Abstrusa’ the interpretation is due to a comment in the margin of the Vita Vergili prefixed to the scholia which the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ used.

Grip(h)es: “quadrupedes volucres” Donatus ait (ad Ecl. 8, 27) “genus infestum equis aput *(H)yperboreos* oriundum”. (GR 195. No label LP. Reappears in PP)

quadrupes L; ait gripides infestum LP quadrupes dicuntur gripides inf. G; riundum G.

Compare Serv. on Ecl. 8, 27 (Grypes autem genus ferarum in Hyperboreis nascitur montibus; omni parte leones sunt, alis et facie aquilis similes, equis vehementer infestae) and a very similar passage in Is. Et. 12, 2, 17.

The first two words of the interpretation may not be those of Donatus, but of some other commentator who added the note of Donatus to his own.

Obest: Donatus “dolosus est qui inprudenti obest”. (OB 97. No label LPC. Reappears in PP)

dolo sest C; inpugnanti G.

Possibly from a scholium on Geo. 1, 373-4 (numquam imprudentibus imber obfuit).

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

22 Sensus: nota pro ‘sensus corporis’ ‘sensus’ dici. Donatus grammaticus ait “Epicureus ostendit omnia comprehendendi posse sensu corporis”. (SE 343. Gloss. PC; no label TV. Reappears in PP)

L omits entirely. Sensa PVT; per TV; sensa PTV; doci TV; opicureus G; conpreendi G; posse sensa P possensa c. T; conpraehendi post sensa V.

Goetz (Thes. Gloss. Emend.) prefers to read ‘Epicurus’, but the alteration is unnecessary and possibly misleading. He rightly refers the item to a scholium on Geo. 2, 247 (sensu). Clearly we are dealing with a variorum-commentary which made use of Donatus.

23 Frugi: parci. Donatus “Cartaginenses accumbunt ut luxoriosi, Itali sedent ut frugi e(t) fortes”. (FR 262. No label LP)

accumbent LP.

From a note in a variorum-commentary on Aen. 1, 708.

Compare the note of SD (.....discumbere autem iuxta consuetudinem suorum temporum dixit, quia olim sedentes vescebantur).

24 Fungeretur: exemplum operis [†]facere[†] monstraretur. Virgilius (Aen. 1, 737) “summo tenus attigit ore”: (Don. ad loc.) “ut bibentis fungeretur officiis”. (FU 210. Gloss. LP. Reappears in PP)

facere provaretur G; summoque adtigit LP sumoque adtingit G; viventis LPG; officio G.

This item (commented on in Class. Quart. 15, 193) is of especial interest because we can see the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ at work. There was a marginal note on the word ‘fungeretur’ used in the scholium, and he made of this word the main part of his item; but he carelessly added, not only the scholium which the marginal note explained, but the line of Virgil to which the scholium itself referred.

If it be true that the set of scholia used was of the variorum-type and contained other material besides that of Donatus, we must admit that the ascription of the words ‘ut bib. fung. officiis’ to Donatus is more definite than may be considered justifiable.

Note also Part I §11 and items 184, 198, and 254.

DRACONTIUS

Molossos: canes. Dracontius (Laud. 1, 279) “et raukos
timuit discurrens damma Molossos”. (MO 223. No
label LPTVC)

Mollosus L; dragontius L dracontios T (not PVC); discurrere LPTVC;
molosos L.

That this is the only quotation from Dracontius in Lib. is to be explained, not by supposing that some glossary-compiler thought this the only suitable excerpt for his glossary, but by supposing that the variorum-commentary used by ‘Abstrusa’ occasionally quoted the Bible and Christian poets. This passage would be pertinent at least for a scholium on Geo. 3, 405 (acremque Molossum).

ENNUS

“Carinantes” (Ennius, Ann. 181 Vahl.): argutantes. (CA
722. No label LP)

Derived from a scholium on Aen. 8, 361 (lautis mugire Carinis), where SD writes: Carinare autem est obtrectare. Ennius ‘contra carinantes verba atque obscena profatus’. The interpretation either may be a marginal note to the scholium which the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ remodelled, or may be part of the scholiast’s own exposition of the passage of Ennius. Since in the extant Abstrusa we find: Karinantes: inludentes vel inridentes, it is more likely that our item and the Abstrusa-item are both parts of a long scholium.

Lactens: est qui lacte alitur, lactans qui decipit; lactens
lacte abundans, ut (?Ennius, Ann. 71 Vahl.) “lactentes
ficos”; Lucilius (?1198^a) “lactentia coagula cum melle
(bibi”); lactea: candida, ut “lactea) laudas brac(ch)ia”
(Horatius (Carm. I 13, 2) dixit). (LA 192. No label
LPTVA)

Lacteus LPTVA (and some MSS. of Caper, Gramm. Lat. VII 98); est
some MSS. of Caper omit; alitur et lac. some MSS. of Caper; decepit T;
lacteus LPTVA (and some MSS. of Caper); ut lactantes PA; ficus: Caper;
ficos lacibus lact. LTVA latibus lact. P; Luc. dicit: some MSS. of Caper;

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

lactantia LPTVA (not Caper); coagilatum P -ilacum LA -ulatum TV; bibi lac. cand. ut: supplied from Caper; cerea laudas MSS. of Horace; Hor. dixit: supplied from Caper.

The first difficulty is the proper ascription of the first two citations in this item, and the parallel passage of Caper does not really help us, even if we accept the poorly attested reading 'Lucilius dicit'. Either the first citation, or the second, is anonymous. Since in Caper, Horace's name is given after the citation from his works, we might argue that the Lucilius-citation is the one which precedes his name. How weak such an argument would be need not be indicated. From the mere arrangement of the item no certain attributions can be deduced.

In his edition of Lucilius, Marx (differing from his predecessor Dousa) attributed the words 'lactentes ficos' to Lucilius as fragment 1198. The following citation he rejected because, as it stands, it seems to be unmetrical, and because the word 'coagula' is not attested before Varro.

The suggestion that 'coagula' is here trisyllabic (like 'coagulet' in Dirae, 74; cf. Class. Quart. 15, 193) indeed does not solve the metrical difficulties; but we have no ground for assuming that the words are in their original order, or are even a continuous and full citation. Nor is the objection that 'coagula' does not happen to be found earlier than Varro a sufficient reason in itself for denying that the citation may be a fragment of Lucilius.

The form 'ficos' (to which the MSS. of Caper do *not* point) found favor with Marx as being Lucilian; but the second declension form is found also in Ennius. Charisius (Gramm. Lat. I 128) attests that Ennius wrote 'fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto (and in that connexion cites from Lucilius 'fici comeduntur et uvae'). Now Charisius was not concerned with the words 'lactans' and 'lactens' and when we find 'lactantes' in the MSS. of his work we cannot be certain that Ennius did not write 'lactentes', but we can be sure that Ennius wrote 'fici'. On the other hand, Caper and Lib. were concerned with the distinction between 'lactens' and 'lactans' and not interested in deciding whether 'fici' or 'ficos' or 'ficus' was the actual word qualified by 'lactentes'. With some hesitation

then the first citation is treated as a loose reminiscence of the line of Ennius cited by Charisius, and the second is treated, as Dousa treated it, as a fragment of Lucilius.

The implied substitution of 'lactea' for 'cerea' in the Horace-citation is possibly due to a slip on the part of the scholiast; but since the word 'lactea' was important for his purpose it is possible that he had a text of Horace different from ours.

For the relation between Caper and certain items of Lib. see Part I § 51. If Caper was not the direct source of this item, we should derive it from a scholium on Geo. 1, 315 and attention is here drawn to the notes on item No. 205 where a long scholium on that line of Virgil is reconstructed.

HORACE

Damm(a)e: generis feminini. <Horatius (Carm. I 2, 11)
 "et superie(c)to pavidae natarunt aequore dammae".
 (DA 51. Gloss. LPTV)

superiet io pavidus T; pavid V; aequo reddammae T.

Derived from a scholium on Ecl. 8, 28 (timidi dammae) where Serv. writes: et dammas masculino genere posuit; sic alibi 'timidi dammae cervique fugaces'. Horatius feminino ait 'et superiecto pav. nat. aeq. dammae'. The grammatical interpretation of our item would be unnecessary if the item were derived from a text of Horace; Servius shows us how it has come from an illustrative comment on a line of Virgil.

Horace, Carm. I 13, 2 is quoted in item No. 27.

Prelum: Horatius (Carm. I 20, 9) "et prelo domitam Caleno tu bibes uvam" pro vino dixit. (PR 1946. No label LPTVCAW)

Proelium PC Praelium T (not V); orant et LPTVCAW; proelo P praelo L; pr. ditam LPTVA dicam C dican W; culenitum bib. TV; tum bib. LPCAW; bibis LPTVCAW; unam C.

Possibly from a scholium on Geo. 2, 242 (prelorum) where the metaphorical use of the word would be noted.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

30 Kateias: *Gallica lingua dicimus lantias; unde et Virgilius* (Aen. 7, 741) “*Teutonico ritu soliti torquere cateias*”; *et Horatius* (Carm. I 27, 5) “*acinaces*” posuit pro *gladios Medorum*. (KA 134. No label LPT)
 Katelas P; gallicas T; lantias T; et T omits; kategas P kateias LT; cladios LP; mediorum LP.

From a scholium on Aen. 7, 741. Compare item No. 242 where the full scholium is reconstructed. Did a misreading of the last sentence of a similar scholium produce Isidore’s strange ‘*haec et cateia quam Horatius caiam dixit*’ in Et. 18, 7, 7? And does the first part of the item give us a clue to the provenience of the scholia which were used by ‘*Abstrusa*’?

31 Tempestivius: (Hor. Carm. IV 1, 9) “*tempestivius in domum Pauli purpureis ales oloribus comissabere Maximi*”. (TE 199. No label LP)
 tempestivus in L; purpureis L; alis LP; comes habere LP.

The preceding item in Lib. (TE 198: *Tempestivam: temporalem ac per hoc maturam*, labelled De Gls) reminds us of the Servian scholium on Geo. 1, 256 (*Tempestivam: opportunam, maturam*). TE 198 and 199 may quite well have been one item originally, and derived from an illustrative scholium on Geo. 1, 256. Compare item No. 135.

32 Eliminavit: *extra limen extulit ut apud Horatium* (Epist. I 5, 25) “*ait qui dicta foras eliminet*”. (EL 141. Placidi LPTV; no label A)

lime P limitem TV; expulit TV and Placidus (21, 6); ut apud—eliminet MSS. of Placidus omit; caput oratium P; sunt qui LTV; eliminant TV.

Since the Roman MSS. of Placidus give part of this item, the quotation may be part of a longer Placidus-gloss (cf. Part I § 21). Furthermore, the lemma-word is not Virgilian; nor is its form due to the quotation (cf. Part I § 14). It could perhaps be argued that the words ‘*ut apud—eliminet*’ are really a separate item which has lost its lemma and been fused with a genuine Placidus-gloss. In that case the citation may have been found in a scholium on some occurrence of ‘*limen*’ in Virgil.

JUVENAL

Sartus: consutus. Iuvenalis (3,254) "scinduntur tunic(a)e sartae". (SA 481. No label LP)

scanduntur P escanduntur L; sartum LP.

Possibly from a scholium on Geo. 4, 249 (sarcire).

Turtur: avicula blanda de qua Iuvenalis (6,39) "turture magno" generis masculini. Physiologus dicit de turture (TU 243. Gloss. LP)

The additional matter attributed to 'Physiologus' is really a separate item which has been fused with TU 243. Juvenal presumably was quoted in a scholium on Ecl. 1, 58 (turtur); and the shortness of the citation is in favor of that view. At that place Serv. and Philargyrius assert that the word is found in both genders, and illustrate the masculine by Plautus (Most. 45). Compare also Dub. Nom. 592, 3: Turtur generis masculini ut Plautus.....quamvis Pollio et alii dicant turellas.

Quinquatria: quinque porticorum ambitus puto. (QUI 172. Gloss. LP)

It is open to doubt whether this item is a genuine quotation-gloss and germane to our inquiry.

The lemma-word is not found in this form in Juvenal, and not at all in Virgil; yet one thinks most readily of Juvenal 10, 115. The interpretation is not what would be expected from one who had the Juvenal-context before him. The extant Juvenal-scholium (quod intra quinque atria fit) is more rational.

In the Abavus-glossary we also have the gloss: Quinquatria: Minervalia. Both items possibly are from 'Abstrusa' and may be the fragments of a discursive scholium on some line of Virgil referring to Minerva. In that case our item would be due to a marginal comment on the citation in the scholium.

LIVY

"Votis in Capitolio rite nuncupatis" (Livy, 22, 1, 6): more nuncupatis, id est celebratis. (VO 150. No label LPTVC)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

votis rite in C. n. MSS. of Livy; capitulio LP; morentur cupatis LP.

The unusual enumeration of this item is due to a late-discovered slip and has no further significance. The item is attributed to Placidus (C. G. L. v 103, 9) by Goetz without any sound justification.

No one would pretend that this solitary excerpt from Livy came directly from a marginal note in a text. We therefore inquire whether it could have come from Virgil-scholia. At any occurrence of 'rite' a Virgil-scholiast might have cited the Livy-passage; but certain scattered items in Abstrusa, Lib., and the Ab Absens-glossary seem to indicate that this item came from a scholium on the word 'votum' (e.g. on Aen. 2, 17: *votum pro reditu simulant*). The full scholium as found in 'Abstrusa' may be reconstructed as follows:—*Votum: voluntate promissum* (= Abstrusa 195, 43^a), *<ut> 'Votis in Capitolio rite nuncupatis'*, *<id est> votis in Capitolio solito more nuncupatis* (= Ab Absens, C. G. L. iv 426, 42; cf. Lib. VO 150), *<id est> celebratis* (= Lib.); *votivum: quod promissum est votis* (= Abstrusa 195, 43 = Lib. VO 152), *<id est> quod iam dedicatum est voto in Capitolio solito* (= Lib. VO 149, wrongly labelled 'Placidi'). Another item of Ab Absens (426, 41):—*Votis nuncupatis: quod occurrit iam dedicatum votum*) seems to be a confused version of parts of this original 'Abstrusa-'item.

LUCAN

36 “Glacialem <frigore> pontum” (Luc. 1, 18): *Scythiae maris ubi aqua durescit frigore.* (GL 8. Virgili LPVAW) potum LPV (not AW); scithiae V iscitiae PA inscitiae L iste maris W.

The label 'Virgili' in Lib. refers to short marginal notes taken from Virgil-MSS.; but it is not easy to believe that this item has come from such short marginal notes as are usually indicated by that label. Since the labels 'Virgili' or 'Vgl' and 'De Gl's' are sometimes demonstrably confused in Lib. it is probable that the present item properly belongs to the citation-glosses and should be labelled 'De Gl's'.

If this item is not from a Lucan-scholium (and neither ASL nor CBL afford any clue), it might be regarded as a fragment of a scholium on Geo. 3, 349 (Maeotiaque unda). cf. item No. 54.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Leucas: Lucanus (1, 43) “⟨premit⟩ aspera classes Leucas”; bellum navale quod ⟨A⟩eneas cum Antonio gessit; unde et Virgilius (Aen. 8, 677) “fervere Leucaten”. (LE 337. No label LPTVAWD)

classis LPTV; antonino LTVAWD (not P); ferv. lancatem LP.

ASL and CBL note the gender, and quote Virgil's line for the masculine. On that ground the item might be derived from a Lucan-scholium. Yet a Virgilian scholiast might have quoted Lucan to illustrate Aen. 8, 677; and the slip of 'Aeneas' for 'Octavianus' seems to point to such a source. For a similar confusion of names, see No. 178.

Dediscere: est amittere quod didiceris. Lucanus (1, 130) “longoque togae tranquillior usu dedidicit iam pace ducem”, hoc est amisit. (DE 269. No label LPTVAW) quod diceris late longeque LPTVAW; togae TV omit; usui TV; dedit LP didicit TV; pacem T.

The lemma-word is not Virgilian, but the two preceding items in Lib. (DE 267 Dediscit: perdidit, labelled De Gls; DE 268 Dediscit: quod didicerat amisit) might lead us to suppose that this item is a fragment of a long scholium on some line of Virgil (containing disco). Priscian (Gramm. Lat. III 267) quotes this line of Lucan (for the use of the accusative) immediately after noting Ecl. 2, 1 (ardebat Alexim). This is a small but not valueless indication for claiming our item as part of an annotated scholium on Ecl. 2, 1.

Superaverat: transierat. Lucanus (1, 183) “superaverat Alpes”. (SU 721. No label LPTVC)

Superavertit P (not C); superabat PC (not LVT).

The lemma-form is not Virgilian, but may be due to the influence of the quotation. There are many other parts of the verb in Virgil where the Lucan-citation may have been used as an illustration.

Classica: tuba. Lucanus (1,238) “rauco classica ⟨cornu⟩. classica⟩ dicta sunt quod per classes dividebatur exercitus, qui postea manipuli dicti sunt. (CL 108. No label LP)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

tubam P; rauco P omits.

This item and CL 109 (=item No. 75) form a pair, each beginning 'Classica: tuba, Lucanus'. It is not clear whether there is any significance in this fact. We might suppose that the same simple note was found in the marginal notes of a text of Lucan at 1,238 and 6,166 and that these notes were remodelled for glossary-purposes. But the explanatory material in the present item cannot be referred easily to marginal notes (though it may be a separate item which by accident has become fused with CL 108). Again, the Lucan-citation in item No. 75 is itself explained; and that explanation (though it may have been found as well as the interpretation of 'classica' in the same marginal note) was perhaps added by a Virgil-scholiast who quoted the Lucan-phrase. In short, if any one claimed that this item and No. 75 are both parts of an etymological and illustrative scholium on Aen. 7, 637 (classica iamque sonant), it would be difficult to prove him wrong.

41 Emeritis: emeriti dicuntur veterani soluti a militia, ut Lucanus (1, 344) "quae sedes erit emeritis?". (EM 44. Gloss. LPAW; no label TV)

veteranei T; solutique TV; ut locum quae P ut locum quem des L militia quem sedes AW; ut locum que sedesorte emeritis sedes erit emeritis TV; erit P omits.

This item seems to have come from Virgil-scholia by way of 'Abstrusa'; for in our extant Abstrusa we find (62, 20) 'Emeritus: miles dicitur veteranus qui complevit militiam, quia merer*it* militare dicitur', and in Is. Et. (9, 3, 34) 'Emeriti dicuntur veterani solutique militia qui iam in usu proelii non sunt et quia mereri militare dicitur, ab stipendiis scilicet quae merentur'. All three seem to have a common source which is undoubtedly Virgil-scholia. It is true that no part of the lemma-verb is found in Virgil, but a glance at Part I §13 will suffice to show that a scholium on Aen. 4, 335 (promeritam) would be a very possible source. Compare item No. 69.

42 Lemannus: fluvius Galliae a quo Lemanni vocantur; de quibus Lucanus (1, 396) "deseruere cavo teuntoria flxa Lemanno". (LE 96. Isidori LP. Appears also in PP)

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

desuerecauo G deseruereu auo P.

The label seems to refer to Is. Et. 9, 2, 94 (populi inhabitan tes iuxta Lemannum fluvium Alemanni vocantur; de quibus Luc. 'des. c. t. f. Lem.'). But the words 'fluvius Galliae' show that Isidore is not really the source of this item. Possibly the compiler of Lib. had this item and the Isidore-excerpt before him, copied the one, and labelled it according to the more definite source. Serv. on Geo. 4, 278 (flumina Mellae) gives the same words as Isidore (omitting 'de quibus'), but his preceding phrases (Mella fluvius Galliae sicut etiam) may afford an indication of how our item arose from a similar scholium on that line.

Cometem: stella flammam in modum faculae dans; cum apparuerit regni mutationem facit. Lucanus (1, 529) "et terris mutantem regna cometem" et Vergilius (Geo. 1, 488) "nec diri totiens arsere cometae". (CO 420. No label LPTV)

flammam TV flaminam L fluminum P; damas L; et tueris TV; mutantem L mutatam T; ars. cometem LP (not TV).

SD on Aen. 10, 272 has a very long note on comets, their shapes and significance; but he has nothing parallel to this item. ASL and CBL afford no more help. But in Isidore (De Nat. Rerum 26, 13, expanding Et. 3, 71, 16) we find: Cometes stella est quae velut comas luminis ex se fundit. haec cum nascitur aut regni mutationem fertur ostendere aut bella aut pestilentias surgere. de qua Prudentius ait 'tristis cometa intercedit' et Lucanus 'et terris minitantem regna cometem' et Vergilius 'nec diri tot. ars. cometae'. Isidore gives the same information as our item, but is fuller; his Virgil-citation is the same, but his Lucan-citation different. We might at once claim that both our item and the Isidore-passage came from a scholium on Geo. 1, 488. But as soon as we adduce the passage of Isidore we must notice that CBL on 1, 529 (quae velut comas luminis fundens mortes facit) has sufficient resemblance to parts of the Isidore-passage for a critic to contend that Isidore took his information not from Virgil-scholia but from a Lucan-scholium, and that the item of Lib. came from the same or from a similar source. On the other hand, this coincidence cannot be pressed too far, since CBL are

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

quite obviously indebted to Virgil-scholia, and it is more probably true that CBL, Isid., and Lib. are all indebted to Virgil-scholia. Compare CO 418 (Cometa: nomen stellae, masculini generis. Vergilius 'nec diri tot. ars. cometae', labelled De Gl.).

44 Urnae: sepulturae. Lucanus (1, 568) "gemuerunt ossibus urnae". (UR 40. No label LPTVC)
genuerunt LPTVC.

The interpretation fits the Lucan-line and does not fit any occurrence of the word in Virgil. If then this item came from Virgil-scholia, and not from a Lucan-scholium, we must assume that Lucan was quoted to illustrate other meanings of the word. This view might receive some support from the fact that some Abstrusa-MSS. have a not dissimilar item (196, 5a Urna: sepulchra).

45 C(h)elae: bracchia scorpii, eo quod fissa sint. Lucanus (1, 659) "chelasque peruris". (CE 180. No label LP)
Celes LP; caelasque L celosque P; perrures LP.

This etymological item can scarcely come from a marginal note; it is either from a Lucan-scholium or from a Virgil-scholium. ASL and CBL give no help. One MS. of Serv. at Geo. 1, 33 (the only place where Virgil uses the word) has: Cheles scorpionis bracchia sunt; but that does not amount to a proof that our item is from a scholium on that line. If we believe this item is from a scholium then CE 123 (Chelas: bracchia scorpii, labelled De Gl.) and CE 124 (Chelae: pluraliter) would fittingly be regarded as other fragments or duplicates of the same scholium.

46 Meatus: cursus, pluraliter. Lucanus (1, 663) "cur signa meatus deseruere suos?". (ME 19. No label LPTVC)
currus LPTVC; quur LPC (not TV); deser. suos T omits (added by 13th. cent. hand).

Even though CBL at this place give: Meatus: cursus, the item may be from a scholium on Aen. 6, 849 (caelique meatus).

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Excite: excitate. Lucanus (2, 48) “nunc urbes excite feras”.
(EX 285. No label LPTV)

This part of the verb is not Virgilian. Cf. No. 58.

Uter: unus. Lucanus (2, 61) “quaerunt uter imperet orbi”.
(UT 12. No label LPTVCAW)

quorunt LTVAC quo sunt P quo erunt W; imperit LPTA imperat V;
imperi turbi W; urbi LPTVAC.

Delatus: deportatus. (Luc. 2, 88) “pelago delatus in quo
hostilem in terram”. (DE 576. Gloss. LPTV)

Delacus P; terra LPT.

The lemma-word is found in Virgil only at Aen. 3, 441. The Abstrusa-Abolita MSS. (*Vat. a*) give ‘Delatus: deportatus’ in an Abolita-section; but no far reaching conclusion can be drawn from the coincidence of so simple an interpretation.

Diversa: contraria. (Luc. 2, 275) “nam praelata suis
numquam diversa dolebit castra ducis Magni”. (DI
1227. No label LPTV)

num P non TV; repleta T (not V); div. doleum L (apparently); diversa
abolevit T adolevit V.

At first sight this item seems like a marginal note or a short
Lucan-scholium remodelled for glossary-purposes. But per-
haps it was originally connected with the preceding item of
Lib. (DI 1226, Diversa: id est a portu contraria secreta (-cuti?)
in diversa eamus) and should be regarded as part of a scholium
on Aen. 7, 132 (a portu diversa petamus).

Labet: succumbet. Lucanus (2, 291) “terra labet”. (LA
74. No label LPTV)

succumbit V (not T).

The form is not Virgilian. ASL give: id est titubet, ut
Virgilius (Aen. 10, 283) ‘dum trepidant gressique labant
vestigia prima’. cf. Nos. 62 and 86.

Discriminat: separat. Lucanus (2, 357) “vestes discriminat
auro”. (DI 751. No label LPTV)

veteres LPTV; aurum PTV; discriminata virum L.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

The interpretation is not especially apposite either to the line quoted or to Aen. 11, 144 (the only place where Virgil uses the word). Are we therefore to regard the item as part of a long, discursive scholium on Virgil or is the interpretation a rash and foolish guess found in the margin of a Lucan-MS.?

53 Cilicia: provincia iuxta Taurum montem est. Lucanus (2, 594) “Taurosque subegi[t]”, id est gentes Ciliciae a Tauro monte. (CI 117. No label LP)

Taurumque LP; gent / / / a Tauro P

The lemma-word appears neither in Virgil nor in the passage of Lucan cited. But the difficulty seems to be solved when we remember that the whole line of Lucan is “Armenios Cilicasque feros Taurosque subegi”. It seems that our item is merely the fusion of two independent, but consecutive, glosses or scholia on Lucan. ASL give: pro hominibus autem posuit montis nomen; and it would be perverse to attribute this item to Virgil-scholia.

54 Meotides: Scythiae paludes ubi aqua nimio frigore adeo congelascit ut plaustris iter praebeat. Lucanus (2, 641) “Scythici patiens Maeotia plaustri[s]”. (ME 398. No label LPTVC)

scistiae pal. PC scisciae LT (not V); palude sub aqua TV; congelescit L; interrebeat TC; scitis LPTVC; paciens PTC; meotica LPTVC.

Perhaps from a scholium on Geo. 3, 349 (cf. Serv.: Maeotis palus est Scythiae, frigore congelascens; and BS at Geo. 3, 362: Paludem in Scythia dicit quae per hiemen plaustris transiri potest, per aestatem navigari). ASL (quae gelu stricta fit iter plaustris) and CBL (quod alligata gelu plaustris transeatur in hieme) are scarcely such close parallels. cf. No. 36.

55 Qurules: Lucanus (3, 107) “vacuaeque loco cessere curules” sedile vel subsellia. (QUU 25. Gloss LPVC; no label T)

Quurules LPTV; vacuo que loco LP vaccuo quae T (not V); cessare LPTC cesere V; quurule PC quurile L quurule TV; sedele TV.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

The word 'curules' is not Virgilian; but since one of the MSS. of Serv. at Aen. 11, 334 quotes this line of Lucan, it is not impossible that our item may have come from a scholium on Virgil. Neither ASL nor CBL have any parallel comment.

Temeratum: pollutum, violatum, ut (Luc. 3, 194) "miscuit ignotas temerato litore gentes". (TE 142. No label LP. Appears in PP also)

ignota LP (not G); lito regentes G.

Most of the items which can fairly be attributed to the remodelling of marginal notes or short scholia found in a text of Lucan mention the author's name, and do not introduce the citation in the manner of this item. The divergence between the lemma and the citation needs explanation, and it is not easy to derive the item from a scholium on Aen. 6, 840 (temerata). The closest parallel to this item is in Abolita (182, 48): Temeratum: violatum vel pollutum. Is our item then a fuller version of the Abolita-gloss (i.e. an 'Abolita'-gloss) or is it really the fusion of two glosses, of which the second has lost its distinctive lemma-word? If the whole comes from 'Abolita' is it due to marginal notes in a Virgil-MS. on which 'Abolita', partly relied? cf. Part I §50.

Rifaei: montes Scythiae ut Lucanus (3, 273) <"vertice lapsus Riphaeo">. (RI 25. No label LP)

sciciae L.

The lemma-word is found in this form neither in Lucan nor in Virgil but is of course a form which a glossary-compiler would tend to adopt. If the item is not from a Lucan-scholium —and there is no indication that it is—it may come from a scholium on Geo. 1, 240 (Riphaeasque arces). Serv. at any rate has: Riphaeas autem arces Scythiam dicit, cuius sunt montes Riphaei; and the following items of Lib., together with the present one, may be parts of a note found in a variorum-commentary: RI 23 Rife[r]as arces: Rifei montes sunt Scitiae (labelled De Gls); RI 24 Rifei: montes Thessaliae. The full scholium on Geo. 1, 240 may be reconstructed as:—Riphaeas arces: Riphaei montes sunt Thessaliae vel Scythiae; ut Lucanus 'vert. lap. Riphaeo'.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

58 Excivit: evocavit. Lucanus (3, 291) “excivit populos”.
(EX 292. No label LP)

evocabit LP; *populus* L.

The lemma-form is not Virgilian but may be due to the influence of the quotation. The interpretation is too obvious for any inference to be drawn as to the source of the item. Cf. No. 47.

59 “Faraetonias Syrtes”: extra Libycas alias esse ait Lucanus (3, 295). Syrtes vero Libycae Austro flante siccantur.
(FA 412. Gloss. LP)

Farathoniae LP; *sirtes* LP (twice); *libic-* LP (twice).

It is difficult to decide whether this item is from a Lucan-scholium on the line cited, or from a scholium on Aen. 5, 192 (Gaetulis Syrtibus) where Serv. quotes Horace but not Lucan.

60 Alnus: arbor unde naves fiunt. Lucanus (3, 441) “et fluctibus aptior alnus”. (AL 267. Gloss. LPTV)

faciunt TV.

Either from a short scholium on the Lucan-line or from a scholium on Geo. 1, 136 (*alnos cavatas*). ASL simply cite Geo. 1, 136 and Geo. 2, 451.

61 Efoebi: a Foebo dicti, necdum viri, adolescentuli lenes. Lucanus (3, 518) “mixtis armavit ephebis”. (EF 19 and 165. No labels LPTVAWD)

EF 19:—*Efaebi* a *faebo* V; *aduliscentuli* LP (not VWD) *adolescentes* T; *lenis* PW.

EF 165:—TV omit entirely; LPAW join with EF 164 (Effugium: est affectus fugae); *a Foebo dicti* LP omit; *viri id est aduliscentuli* LP; *armabat efoebit* L.

The word ‘ephebi’ is not Virgilian. But our item comes from the same source ultimately as Is. Et. 11, 2, 10 (Puer a puritate vocatus quia purus est et necdum lanuginem floremque genarum habens. hi sunt ephebi, id est a Pheobo dicti, necdum viri, adolescentuli lenes) and we may refer it to a Virgil-scholium on some occurrence of ‘puer’. Notice also in confirmation that Abstrusa has retained the short form ‘Ef.: aduliscentes’ (C. G. L. IV 60, 2 = Lib. EF 18).

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Labant: deficiunt. Lucanus (4, 89) “castra labant”. (LA 3. No label LPT)

def. lucem castra LP; luc / / / castra T (with ‘Lucanus’ in the margin).

The lemma-word occurs at Aen. 5, 432; 10, 283; 12, 905; but the interpretation is of an obvious nature. Cf. Nos. 51 and 86.

Salix: arbuscula est viminis, Lucanus (4, 131) “cana salix”. (SA 207. Isidori P; no label LVC)

lucanucana C lucanu cana P (not LV).

The label in P should refer to SA 208 (=Is. Et. 17, 7, 47). If this item were originally connected with SA 206 (Salix lenta: feminini generis) we should refer them both to a scholium on Ecl. 3, 83. But since in the Lucan-line the words ‘madefacto vimine’ immediately follow, it may be said the present item is a not inapposite short scholium on the line of Lucan and that SA 206 has nothing to do with it.

Deflagrat: furorem ponit. Lucanus (4, 280) “sic deflagrare minaces”. (DE 387. No label LP)

The verb ‘deflagrare’ is not Virgilian, though the item may have come from a scholium on some occurrence of ‘flagrat’. The divergence of the forms found in the lemma and the citation has no significance.

Fastigia: de imis scrobium dicta; ait Lucanus (4, 296) “ad inrigui premit<ur> fastigia campi”. (FA 522. No label LPV)

scobrium LPV; dicta ut ait V; fastia L.

Serv. on Geo. 2, 288 (fastigium et summas et imae partis possumus dicere) and BS at the same place (Fastigia: scrobium imas fossas dicit) might lead us to suppose that this item is from Virgil-scholia. But ASL and CBL make a remark very similar to that of Serv. and cite Geo. 2, 288 in support. This item therefore may be either from Virgil-scholia or Lucan-scholia.

Cancri axe: in Austro, ubi est [†]pro humero euo[†] ignita. Lucanus (4, 332) “ieiun<i>a solvant <non super arentem> Meroen Cancrique sub axe”. (CA 611. Gloss. LPTV)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Cancri ace PTV; humore T; est prope Meroen regio ignita: Buecheler; meroenem TV meroenen LP; cancriquae TV; ace PTV.

Unless this is a Lucan-scholium—as the non-Virgilian lemma-phrase seems to indicate—the only reasonable place in Virgil where a scholiast may have cited Lucan is Ecl. 10, 68 (sub sidere Cancri).

67 Lupatis: frenis. Lucanus (4, 758) “spuma lupatis”. (LU 345. No label LPTV)

Lucanus lurida pallens LPTV (cf. No. 73)

In Lib. there are two items:

LU 345 Lupatis: frenis. Lucanus ‘lurida pallens’.

LU 366 Lurida: livida. Lucanus ‘spuma lupatis’.

It is clear that at some time or other the two items stood next to one another, and that the citations have been interchanged. In the PP-glossary, LU 345 is not to be found, while LU 366 appears correctly as: Lurida: livida. Lucanus ‘lurida pallens’. The inference to be drawn is that the confusion arose, not in any common source of Lib. and PP, but solely during the compilation and arrangement of Lib. itself.

Whether this present item in its correct form is from a short Lucan-scholium is by no means certain. For Serv. at Geo. 3, 208 writes:—Duris parere lupatis: frenis asperrimis; and Abstrusa (C. G. L. iv 111, 21) gives:—Lupatis: frenis. A very strong case could therefore be made for regarding this item as derived from Virgil-scholia by way of ‘Abstrusa’.

68 Fastis: libellis ubi nomina consulum inscribuntur. Lucanus (5, 5) “nova nomina fastis”. (FA 543. No label LP)

libellus L; consulum (altered from ‘cingulum’) L.

In the St. Gall-glossary (C. G. L. iv 237, 27) we find: Fastus et fasti libri sunt ubi sunt nomina consulum; in the Abavus-glossary (C. G. L. iv 341, 34) we have: Fastus et fasti libri ubi nomina consulum scribuntur. Are these two items and the present one from Lib. derived from ‘Abstrusa’? That such may be the case is indicated, though not quite proved, by the presence in Abstrusa (73, 50) of:—Fastus: consolatus, and in a section of *Vat. a*, which is demonstrably

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

not all *Abolita* (cf. Goetz' app. crit.), we have (74, 45): *Fastus: libri consolator*. 'Fasti' is not a Virgilian word but it might quite well have been discussed in many a Virgilian scholium.

Emeriti: antiqui. Lucanus (5, 7) "dum tamen emeriti".
(EM 45. No label LPTV)

Lucianus L.

This item may have arisen from an illustration of the word 'emeriti' in the scholium from which No. 41 came. At the same time, it is admitted that the marginal notes of a Lucan-text or a short Lucan-scholium may have been the source of this item. ASL interpret the word at this place as 'expleti'.

Munia: officia civitatum. Lucanus (5, 8) "belli per munia patres". (MU 202. Gloss. LPTVCA; no label WD.
Appears also in PP)

civitatum L civitacium T civitantium G; civ. locum LPTVCAWD civ.
luc G; belli LAW omit; pro munia LPCAWG (not TVD).

That 'munia' is not a Virgilian word is rather in favor of our regarding the item as derived from Lucan-marginalia or scholia. That this and the two preceding items draw their citations from neighbouring lines of Lucan is perhaps merely a coincidence; but it may imply that a text of Lucan was used by a common source ('Abstrusa?') of Lib. and PP. It is unsafe to draw any conclusion from the note given by ASL: *hoc est 'belli per munia', hoc est per officia*.

Regia: regnum. Lucanus (5, 62) "regia Lagi". (RE 738.
No label LPTCV. Appears also in PP)

luc regia G.

Possibly from a scholium on *Geo.* 1, 503 (*caeli regia*). cf.
No. 93.

Delfica: civitas. Lucanus (5, 74) "Delphica T(h)ebanae";
et haec T(h)ebanae civitas. (DE 603. No label LPTV)
Del. tenebane L; et ex tenebane L.

The interpretation of the lemma and the additional matter which we find in this item have little to do with the Lucan-passage: 'cui numine mixto Delphica Thebanae referunt

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

trieterica Bacchae'. CBL at this place give: *idem est Liber qui et Apollo et Sol; ut Virgilius (Aen. 6, 77-78) 'ad Phoebi nondum patiens inmanis in antro bacchatur'*. Serv. on Aen. 6, 78 writes: *bene 'bacchatur'*. *idem est Apollo qui Liber pater, qui Sol; unde ait Lucanus 'cui numine mixto Delphica Thebanae referunt trieterica Bacchae'*.

So far then, it is clear that our item could have come either from a Lucan-scholium or from a Virgil-scholium. If it came from a Lucan-scholium, it is difficult to understand the idiotic comment. If however a Virgil-scholium was the ultimate source, we may suppose that the Lucan-citation was annotated in the margin. It was first explained that 'Delphica' referred to a place; and, to make assurance doubly sure, a similar note was added for the benefit of 'Thebanae'.

73 **Lurida: livida.** Lucanus (5, 549) "lurida pallens". (LU 366. No label LPTV)

libida LPTV; lucanus spuma lupatis LPTV (not G).

For the confusion of citations see notes to No. 67. The lemma-word is found in Virgil only at Culex 47. ASL at this place give: *ore incerto et pallido colore suffusa*.

74 **Fasces: honores consulum.** Lucanus (5, 663) "tuli fasces", *id est accepi consulatum*. (FA 460. No label LP)

CBL merely give: *consulatum merui*; ASL give: *id est fasces tuli*.... But the item does not look like a Lucan-scholium at all; for the addition at the end virtually includes the information given by the lemma and its interpretation. It seems much more likely that the item is from a Virgil-scholium, on some occurrence of 'fasces', where the Lucan passage was cited and explained in order to enforce the point. Serv. at Geo. 2, 495 gives: *Populi fasces: honores qui a populo praestabantur*; and BS give: *id est honores*. But there are traces of a longer scholium, possibly on this same line of Virgil, and not unconnected with our item. For in Abstrusa we have (73, 13):—*Fasta: honores*; in the First Amplonian-glossary (C. G. L. v 360, 7):—*Fasces: dignitas*; and a much fuller form than either in Lib. (FA 459):—*Fasces: honores sive dignitas consularia*. We must remember that long items were divided

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

by the compilers of 'Abstrusa' and of Lib., and if we read Lib. FA 459 and 460 together, they do not make an unintelligible scholium. cf. Part I §13.

Classica: tuba. Lucanus (6, 166) 'succendunt classica cantu', id est bellum movent. (CL 109. No label LPTV)

tubam TV; cantum P tantum L tantam TV; mobent L.

This item is discussed in the notes to No. 40. For the addition of a precise explanation of the Lucan-citation cf. No. 74.

Detrudit: excludit. Lucanus (6, 174-5) "nunc sude <nunc duro contraria pectora conto> detrudit muris". (DE 1221. No label LPTV)

Lucanus TV omit; retrudit muris P.

Cf. Part I §14 a. Possibly from a scholium on Aen. 1, 145, where probably not the whole Lucan-passage was cited but only the words necessary for an illustration.

Degneres animi: timidi. Lucanus (6, 417) "degeneres trepidant animi". (DE 485. No label LPTV)

Degeneris PTV; trepidunt V.

CBL merely cite Aen. 4, 13 (degeneres animos timor arguit) in illustration. If the item is not from a Lucan-scholium it can be referred easily to a Virgil-scholium.

Scilleis: Lucanus (6, 421) "qui mox Scyllaeis exul grassatus in undis". (SC 161. No label LPTV. Appears also in PP)

Scileis T; lucns G; scelleis PTC scilleis LVG; exsul P; grassatur G.

Possibly from a scholium on Aen. 1, 200 (Scyllaeam) or on Ecl. 6, 74 (cf. Lib. SC 159).

Excrementa: unguis manuum. Lucanus (6, 543) "excrementa manus". (EX 324. No label LPTV)

excremento manus P excrement L excreimenti TV; mane T (apparently).

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

The interpretation precisely fits the citation and the lemma is not Virgilian. Only indirectly, if at all, could the citation and the interpretation have found a place in any Virgil-scholium. ASL give the explanation: *ungues dicit extremos*.

80 C⟨h⟩alybem: ferrum, generis feminini. Lucanus (6, 547)
 “insertam manibus c⟨h⟩alybem. (CA 196. No label LPTV)
 femini V; insertum MSS. of Lucan.

‘Insertam’ in the citation is clearly supported by the words of the interpretation. The item is either from the margin of a poor text of Lucan or, more probably, from a scholium on Aen. 8, 446 (chalyps) or Aen. 10, 174 (Chalybum) where an inferior reading of Lucan was used for a contrast of gender. ASL give: *id est ferum*; but the coincidence is insignificant.

81 Erebi: inferi. Lucanus (6, 635) “cessissent leges Erebi”.
 (ER 61. No label LPTV)
 Ieres Erebi LPTV.

82 Aequē: similiter. Lucanus (7, 17) “venerabilis aequē”.
 (AE 198. Gloss. LPTV)

Abstrusa 11, 44 (Aequē: similiter) cannot be used as a proof that this item is derived from ‘Abstrusa’. But Serv. on Geo. 2, 454 (quid memorandum aequē) discusses the variant ‘et quae’ but concludes that ‘aequē’ means ‘similiter’. Did his source (or another scholiast) use the Lucan-passage in support of that view, and may not our present item have been derived ultimately from such a scholium?

83 Affusi: humiles, deiecti vel supplices. Lucanus (7, 71)
 “affusi vinci sacerum”. (AF 118. Gloss. LPTC)
 defecti LPTV.

The lemma is not Virgilian; but it is not impossible that Lucan was quoted in connexion with Aen. 1, 214 (fusi) where Serv. discusses the various meanings of the simple verb.

84 Havet: vult, cupid. Lucanus (7, 84) “scire senatus avet”.
 (HA 118. Gloss. LP)
 cupidus L; lacunus LP; havet LP.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

The lemma is not Virgilian. CBL give the interpretation 'cupit' only; ASL give: *cupit et avide vult*. These coincidences however are not striking since the interpretations are obvious.

Lymphato: vario, diverso. Lucanus (7, 186) "lymphato trepidasse metu". (LI 352. No label LP. Appears also in PP)

trepidas semetu G; tripidasse P.

The interpretation of the lemma is intelligible when taken with the quotation from Lucan; but it is scarcely likely to have arisen from a scholium on Aen. 7, 377 (lymphata).

Labant: deficiunt. Lucanus (8, 60) "membra relicta labant". (LA 4. No label LP)

Cf. Nos. 51 and 62.

Cautes: petrae, generis feminini. Lucanus (?8, 195) "asperas cautes". (CA 1148. No label LPTV)

petre T; genesis P; quas Samiae cautes et quas Chios asperat undas
Lucan 8, 195.

There is no other line of Lucan which approaches so near to the words given by Lib., and we must regard our item as a garbled citation of it. The item can scarcely have arisen from a Lucan-text or even directly from a Lucan-scholium. It is more likely to have come from a scholium on Aen. 3, 699 (altas cautes).

"**Scrobe**": Lucanus (8, 756) *feminino genere dixit, secutus Plautum*. (SC 322. No label LP. Appears also in PP)

Scrobonem LP Scrobrem G; pautum P.

This is another case where it is difficult to decide whether the item is more likely to have come from a Lucan-scholium or from a Virgil-scholium. In Serv. (on Geo. 2, 288) we find: *ut etiam supra diximus scrobes masculini sunt generis; nam et Cicero in Oeconomicis sic dixit et Plautus ait 'sexagenos scrobes'. minor autem est Lucani et Gracchi auctoritas; nam Lucanus ait 'exigua posuit scrobe', Gracchus 'abunde fossa scrobis est' quod exemplum in Terentiano est.* And already in his comment on Geo. 2, 50 Serv. had remarked: *licet Lucanus*

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

dixerit contra artem ‘exigua posuit scrobe’. So far then the evidence would suggest that our item is a mere fragment of a similar scholium on one of these Virgilian lines. But CBL are parallel to our item and to Serv.: ‘scrobe’ feminini generis, licet Plautus posuerit masculino; quod et artis est, nam hic contra rationem posuit. ASL, briefly noting the gender, cite the same line of Plautus as Servius. From whichever source derived, the Lib.-item has been carelessly remodelled.

89 Strues: acervus lignorum dicitur. Lucanus (8, 757) “strue membra recumbunt”. (ST 391. No label LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

acervum LPTC (not VG); dic. nunc st. LPTVC dic. luc st. G; struem PTVCG strumen L.

The lemma is not Virgilian. At Aen. 3, 22 (tumulus) SD draws a distinction between a number of words of similar meaning such as: pyra, rogus, bustum, tumulus, ustrina, etc., and it is possible therefore that this item came from a similar Virgilian scholium.

90 Spectator: inspector. Lucanus (8, 853) “spectator Nili”. (SP 87. No label LP. Appears also in PP)

luc G; spectatur L; nila G lini LP.

The lemma-word is found in Virgil only at Aen. 10, 443.

91 Tenaron: locus est qua ad inferos descenditur. Lucanus (9, 36) “et apertam Taenaron umbris”; Virgilius (Geo. 4, 476) “Taenarias etiam fauces alta ostia Ditis”. (TE 252. No label LPTVCAWD. Appears also in PP)

Tenaror T; loeus G; quo V; discenditur C; luc G; aperta TVW apertum PC; tenarion LV tenario TAD tenaron G tenarionum PC tenariorum W; numbris TA; umbris PCW omit; Virgilius A omits; Taenarias—Ditis LPTVCAWD (not G) omit; tenareus G.

Serv. at Geo. 4, 466 writes: Taenarias etiam fauces: Taenarus Laconiae promuntorium est circa finem Maleae, ubi inferorum dicitur esse descensus; and BS give a very similar scholium. CBL on the line of Lucan cited give us: ‘apertam’ autem ‘Taenaron umbris’ quoniam sub eo promuntorio specus est per quem creditur ad inferos esse descensus.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Whether our item comes from Virgil-scholia or Lucan-scholia must be held doubtful; for Lucan-scholia sometimes cite Virgil (cf. No. 65).

“Phariaene canes” (Luc. 9, 141): Faraonicas scilicet. (FA 425. No label LP)

Farias carnes LP

This item with its non-Virgilian lemma seems to be little more than a marginal note or a short scholium on Lucan.

“Regia Nili” (Luc. 9, 266): regnum Ptolemaei Alexandriae. (RE 743. Gloss. LP)

ptolemei LP; alexandrie L.

Perhaps a short Lucan-scholium; but possibly from a scholium on Geo. 1, 503 (cf. No. 71).

LUCILIUS

“Cordipugis versibus” (Lucil. 968): litteris corda pungenti-
(bu)s. (CO 2169. No label LPTVA)

This item is attributed to Placidus by Goetz (C. G. L. v 58, 39) with no real justification. The lemma was claimed as a fragment of Lucilius by Baehrens, and was accepted as such by Marx. Lib. is our sole authority for it. Possibly it was quoted in a scholium on Aen. 5, 138 (corda pavor pulsans). It is very unlikely that any glossary-compiler would have obtained it from marginal notes in a text of the author.

Pila (= Is. Et. 18, 69) + peritissimi lusores habitu sunt
Coelius atque Viturius; de Coelio sic dicit Lucilius
(1134-6) “Coelius, conlusor Galloni, scurra, trigonum
cum ludet solus ludet et eludet”. (PI 95. Isidori A;
no label LPTVCWD)

Coelius—Lucilius TV omit; adque LP; dae Coelio C; Galloniscurra LPC
Gallonis virra TV; ludet ecce ludet TV.

For this item Lib. is our sole authority. There is no obvious place in Virgil where the citation would be more than incidental. Possibly the item is an excerpt from Isidore's Liber Artium; but even so, Isidore may have derived it from Virgil-scholia.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

96 Sero: dicimus fruges; praeterito tempore facit sevi: Lucilius (1188) “hic sunt herbae quas sevit Iuppiter ipse”. item ‘sero’ quod est ‘claudio’, unde sera dicta est; praeterito tempore facit ‘seravi’ ut Terentius (Eun. 763) “tu abi atque obsera ostium intus”. item ‘sero’ significat ‘tarde’, idem ‘horam in occasum diei’, ut in Evangelio (Ioh. 20, 19) “una sabbatorum cum sero esset”. (SE 557. No label LPTVCAWD)

dicimus omitted by Explan. in Donat. lib. II (Gramm. Lat. IV 542), fruges PCAD friges LTVW; praeteritum tempus Explan.; sevi Explan.; seravi LPTVCA serui D; Lucilius: Explan., Lucius LPTVCAWD; inesunt herba V; herbas LPTAWD; sevit: Explan., serunt T servit LPVCAWD; perfectum tempus Explan.; seravi reseravi ut: Explan.; terentius PC terentias T terencius V; tutavi LPTVCAWD; observavi LPTVCAWD; hostium LPVC; intus P omits; intus—sero esset: Explan. omits; hoccasum PC; significatur V; evangelium LPTVC.

The Explanatio in Donatum does not seem to have been used directly by the compiler of Lib., and this present item diverges from it sufficiently to discountenance the suggestion that it is a mere excerpt from the Explanatio directly. Nevertheless it is clear that they must have a common source, and that source was most likely a scholium on Geo. 1, 299 (sere nudus). Notice that if this item is from a scholium on Virgil, we have evidence that the commentary was compiled by a Christian.

97 Pistrix: belua maris. Lucilius (1252) “pistrices” dixit pluraliter. (PI 270. Gloss. LPTVCW; Virgili A; no label D)

Pistris TVCD; Laci L, Lucius PTVCD; Luc. pist. A omits.

Lib. is the sole authority for this fragment. There is no reasonable doubt about the authorship; and the reading ‘Lucius’ in place of ‘Lucilius’ will be found in No. 96 where the Explanatio shows it to be a corruption. The item is possibly derived from a scholium on Aen. 3, 427 (where Serv. notes the declension).

LUCRETIUS

“Triquetra”: Lucretius (1, 717) appellat quam Virgilius (1, 196) “litore Trinacrio” nominat, id est tria promuntoria. (TR 353. Gloss. LP)

quem LP; trinagrio P trinacia L; in tria P.

‘Triquetra’ is not a Virgilian word. Serv. however at Aen. 1, 196 writes: Trinacrio: Graecum est propter tria ἄκρα, id est promunturia, Lilybaeum, Pachynum, Pelorum; Latine autem Triquetra dicitur. To this we have only to add, for example: ut Lucretius ‘insula quem triquetris terrarum gessit in oris’, and it will be clear how our item probably arose. Doubtless Lib. TR 322 (Trinacrio: siculo; Trinacia autem Sicilia dicta quod tria acra habeat, id est promunturia, Pachynum, Pelorum, et Lilybaeum) is another fragment of the same scholium.

Laquearibus: legitur et lacunaribus. Lucretius (2, 28) “laqueata aurataque tecta”. (LA 345. No label LPTV)

lucrecius PT; aure ad aque P aurea ad aque L aureataque TV.

The citation is not directly concerned either with the lemma (which is Virgilian) or with the interpretation (which is an indication of a variant reading, not in Lucretius, but in Virgil). The item can therefore not have come directly from a text of Lucretius. Its derivation from Virgil-scholia becomes absolutely certain when we remember that at Aen. 1, 726 (laquearibus aureis) SD writes: legitur et lacuaribus, Cicero Tusculanarum ‘tectis caelatis lacuatis’. There can be no doubt that our item is from a scholium on that line. It is also very possible that LA 343 (Laquearibus: ornamentis tectorum, labelled De Gls) and LA 344 (Lacunaribus: cameris) are both parts of the same scholium.

Extima: extrema, ut Lucretius (4, 647) “extima membrorum circumcaesura” (EX 1240. No label LPTVA)

extranea L; lucretius T; circum casura LPTV.

The lemma is not Virgilian; but in Abstrusa we find ‘Extimus: extremus’ and it is not impossible that the line of Lucretius was quoted by a scholiast at some occurrence of ‘exterus’ or ‘extremus’ in Virgil. Goetz attributes this item to Placidus (C. G. L. v 67, 26) without any clear justification.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

MARTIAL

101 “Inermi f(r)onte” (Mart. 3, 58, 11): sine cornu[a]. (IN 576. Virgili LP)

The label in LP is a mistake and should refer to IN 577. Our item is possibly from a scholium on Aen. 1, 487 (cf. Serv. Manus inermes: aut sine sceptro aut supplices), where a Martial-citation was used as an illustration and was itself explained.

OVID

102 Minotaurus: homo mixtus tauro; de quo poeta (Ovid A. A. 2, 24) “semivirumque bovem semibovemque virum”. Orosius quoque huius monstri in Libro Historiarum sic meminit (MI 120. Orosi LP)

bobem L; semibobemque LP.

Here we have clearly the fusing of two items; for the gloss proceeds to give an excerpt from Orosius (1, 13, 1). The first part is possibly from a scholium on Aen. 6, 26. The label of course should refer only to the second part of this item. For a similar citation of this well-known line from Ovid, cf. Is. Et. 11, 3, 38.

103 Trabea: (Ovid. Fast. 1, 37) “Trabeati cura Quirini”. (TR 8. Virgili LPTVCA)

Trabes LPTVCA; Traebeatra beati W; iura LPTVC; trab. forma Quir.: is also found in Ovid at Metam. 14, 828; quiri PTC (not LV).

This item must be connected with TR 7:—Trabeati: trabea veste induti, ut est illud (labelled De Gl by LPTVC AW). The label affixed to TR 8 is either a slip or a wilful guess. Both the items are fragments from an illustrative scholium to Aen. 7, 188 (succinctus trabea).

104 “Lactantia ubera” (Ovid. Met. 7, 321): sane et qui lacte nutriuntur et ipsae quae nutriunt participialiter lactantes dici possunt; de quo, plena sunt lactantia. (LA 187. No label LP)

sanes P.

The lemma might have been referred almost equally well to Lucretius 5, 885 or Ovid Met. 6, 342. Derived presumably from a scholium on Geo. 1, 315. cf. No. 205.

PERSIUS

Antapodosis (Is. Et. 2, 21, 8) + et apud Persium (1, 27)

“scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter”. (AN 327. Isidori LP)

tum nihil P; tu nihil L; scirae alter P.

If this addition is not due to the interpolated text of Isidore it may quite well be a separate item derived from a Virgil-scholium. From the very nature of such items which illustrate a rhetorical figure, it is not easy to determine with certainty the Virgil-line on which the particular scholium occurred.

Pistores: veteres non moltores sed pistores dicebant, quasi pinsitores, a pinsendis granis frumenti. Persius (1, 58) ‘o Iane, a tergo quem nulla ciconia pinsit’. (PI 266. No label LPTVC)

quasi pinsatores PC; a pindendis LPTC a pensandis V; persuis T; o iane ategr L olaneat ergo T olanea tergo V; que L; nulla tiona LAW nullacione TC nullatione TV.

Neither ‘pistores’ nor ‘pinsitores’ nor any part of ‘pinso’ is in Virgil. But in Serv. (on Aen. 1, 179 fruges torrere) we find: et quia apud maiores nostros molarum usus non erat, frumenta torrebant et ea in pilas missa pinsebant, et hoc erat genus molendi; unde et pinsores dicti sunt qui nunc pistores vocantur. pinsere autem dici Persius probat ut ‘a tergo q. n. c. p.’ There can therefore be no doubt that our item comes from a scholium parallel to that of Serv.

Casia: herba rufi coloris est odorifera. Persius (2, 64)

“haec sibi corrupto casiam dissolvit olivo”. (CA 835. No label LPTV)

ruti PT rutili V; est TV omit; odoriferae T; Persius eo sebi T et sibi V; casian P.

There are several lines of Virgil where this passage of Persius might have been quoted by a scholiast; but at no line would it be more apposite than at Geo. 2, 466 (nec casia liquidi corrumpitur usus olivi).

PLAUTUS

108 *Trium litterarum homo: fur*, Plautus (Aul. 325) “*tu(n), trium litterarum homo*”. (TR 423. No label LPTVC) *tu* T omits (not VC).

Derived from a scholium on Ecl. 3, 16 (fures) where Serv. writes: *furta enim specialiter servorum sunt: sic Plautus de servo ‘homo es trium litterarum’, id est fur.* From a similar scholium comes Is. Diff. I 340 (=Lib. FU 233).

109 *Viscum: genere masculino.* Plautus (Bacch. 50) “*viscus merus est vestra oratio*”. *viscus quasi similitudine viscerum.* (VI 381. Gloss. LPTVCAW)

vicos merus T; *viscos* V; *merus et vera moratio* LPVCAW *vera memoratio* T *merus vostrast blanditia* MSS. of Plautus; *qua simil.* LPTVCA (not W); *similitudo* LPCAW (not TV); *vinum* added by TV (from VI 382)

At some time in its history this item was written with the rare contraction ‘*vera*’ (for *vestra*). This contraction was misunderstood, presumably in the archetype of Lib., and gave rise to ‘*veramoratio*’, on which T (as frequently) tries to improve.

The substitution of ‘*oratio*’ for ‘*blanditia*’ and the transposition of ‘*est*’ indicate that Plautus has been cited by memory. The note upon the gender shows that the citation is due to a scholiast on Geo, 1, 139 (or on Aen. 6, 205). Compare also Dub. Nom. 593, 4; 593, 7.

110 *Palumbes: qui in arboribus degunt.* Virgilius (Ecl. 1, 57) “*raucae, (tua cura,) palumbes*”. Plautus aliter (Bacch. 51) “*unum expetitis*” inquit “*palumbem*”. (PA 234. No label LPTVCAW. Appears also in PP)

Palumbe G; *que* G; *degerunt* G; *urg* G; *rauce rauce pal.* LPC *raucae* TV (once), *rauce palumbe* G; *plaunt* G *plaudunt* LPTVC; *experitis* LPTVC (not G); *est* inquit P²C *inquit* LG; *palumbe* LPCG *palumbae* TV.

From a scholium on Ecl. 3, 69, where BS give:—*Aeriae palumbes; aliquando ‘hi palumbes’.* Compare also Dub. Nom. 586, 20.

111 *Sinus: vas testeum.* Plautus (Curcul. 82) “*eine (hic) cum vino sinus fertur?*”. (SI 503. No label LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Plaustus LPTVC; ei necum vinos infertur G.

From a scholium on Ecl. 7, 33. See notes to No. 182, where Plautus is again quoted.

Proluit: perduxit. *⟨Pl⟩aut⟨us⟩* in Curculione (121) “prolue cloacam”. (PR 2322. No label LPTVC)

Curcula LPTVC; claucam LPTVC.

The tense of the lemma and interpretation is not an obvious one; nor is it due to the quotation. We are therefore justified in deriving this item from a scholium on Geo. 1, 481 (proluit).

Catamitum: quidam vir fuit. Plautus (Menaech. 144) “ubi aquila Catam⟨e⟩itum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum”. (CA 959. No label LPTV)

fuerit TV; plautur L; adonium V.

The form of the lemma is here probably due to the quotation; for the interpretation implies the nominative. Though ‘Catamitus’ is not a Virgilian word, SD on Aen. 1, 28 (Ganymedis) has a note which shows that our item might possibly have come from a scholium on that line.

Ibus: iis, illis. Plautus in Milite Glorioso (74) “ibus dinumerem stipendum”. (IB 28. No label LPTVA)

Ibulsis idest illis = Placidus 28, 26; his illis LP; Plautus — stip.: Plac. omits; mitteglorioso P mittaeglorioso L; stipendia dinum. LP.

Though we cannot be certain that such an item as this might not have been found in some scholium where the declension of the pronouns was discussed, it is at least equally possible that we are dealing, not with a genuine citation-gloss, but with the fuller version of an item which the Roman MSS. of Placidus have curtailed.

Varrant: involant, vexent, trahant. Plautus (Pseud. 164) “vorsa, sparsa, ⟨terta⟩, strata” et “quemadmodum veris”, id est trahis. (VE 259. No label LPTVC)

plaustus C; versa sparsum LPTVC; veris T.

As the lemma indicates, this item comes from a scholium on Aen. 1, 59. At that place Serv. writes:—Varrant: verrere

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

est trahere, a rete quod verriculum dicitur. He also refers to Aen. 1, 478 (versa) where we find him quoting Plautus ('inveniam omnia versa sparsa'). The words 'quemadmodum verris' should probably be regarded as a new fragment of Plautus.

116 Scatebris: scaturiginibus; scatit enim aqua dum in sicco et arido quasi bullit; hoc facit et cum erumpit venis et cum avide sorbetur. (Virg. Geo. 1, 110) "temperat" rusticus scilicet "scatebris". ideo 'excetra' dicta est *(h)ydra* quod scateret percussa in multitudine capitum. sic Plautus (Pseud. 218) multorum penium receptatricem vel malam ancillam 'excetram' *(dicit)* quod ab ea venena scateant. (SC 56. No label LP)
multitudinem LP; capitum P.

As the lemma indicates, this item is from a scholium on Geo. 1, 110. 'dicit' was presumably written as 'd' with cross-stroke and mistaken for a deleted letter.

117 "In angiporto" (Plaut. Pseud. 971?): quasi in anfracto [partium] aedium huius [aedificiorum]. (IN 41. No label LP)

angiponto L; medium P medium L.

This item which has been seriously corrupted may be from a scholium on Aen. 11, 522 (anfractu); or it may perhaps be a lost 'Abolita'-gloss derived from Festus.

118 Hibernas: hibernas, magnas et turbidas; hoc *(loco)* Virgilius. Plautus enim (Rud. 69) "increpui hibernum". (HI 32. No label LPVAW)

magnus V; turpes de hoc V; increpui hibernum PW increpui berna L increpui hiberna A; hiberna V.

The lemma, neither agreeing with the quotation nor being an otherwise obvious form, points either to Geo. 4, 235 or to Aen. 6, 355. The interpretation however indicates that the source of the item was a scholium on Geo. 4, 235 rather than on Aen. 6, 355.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Rudentem: Plautus genere feminino dixit (Rud. 938) “dum ergo tibi hanc quam trahis rudentem complico” in fabula Rudente. (RU 33. Gloss. LPVC. Appears also in PP)

Plaus LPC Plausus V plaut G; dum hanc tibi quam MSS. of Plaut.; tibi G omits; traes G; famula LPVC; rudentem LPC (not VG).

This item is obviously not derived from a text of Plautus directly, but from a scholium where the gender of ‘rudens’ was discussed, that is to say from a scholium on Aen. 3, 267 (excusso rudentes).

Caverna cava: ut “gratam gratiam” aut “raucam rauim” et “laetam laetitiam” Plautus dixit. (CA 1055. No label LP)

aut grata, -tia LP; rauca LP; ruua P raua L; letam LP; plaustrus L.

This item with its three short citations cannot be due to marginal notes on a text of Plautus, or to research on the part of a glossary compiler. The lemma-phrase is not found in the singular in Virgil, but at Aen. 2, 53 we have ‘cavae cavernae’. At that place Serv. writes: Graece figura, ut ‘vitam vivere, mortem mori’; and there can be no reasonable doubt that the item is from a scholium on that line.

QUINTILIAN

Pugnaciter: quasi pugnando; ut est illud Quintiliani (9, 4, 125) “pugnaciter dicendum”. (PU 101. Gloss. LPVC; no label T. Appears also in PP)

Pugnatiter P; illut PG; pugnaciterque LPTVCG; dicendus T.

The adverb is not Virgilian.

Caesim: quasi limate aut dolate. Quintilianus (9, 4, 126) “membratim caesimque dicimus”. (CE 612. No label LPTVA)

Cesim T; quintilianus P; cessim quae T cesimque PV.

Again, as in No. 121, the lemma is not Virgilian. Goetz attributes the item to Placidus, though there is no obvious relation between it and the genuine Placidus item on ‘Caesim’

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

(C. G. L. V 13, 5). The passage of Quintilian might have been cited in a Virgil-scholium on some line containing a part of 'caedo'.

123 **Austera: irata.** Quintilianus (9, 4, 128) "tum austera si accuses, tum fusa si laudes". (AU 404. Gloss. LPTV AW)

Austrae T; ir. Cicero tum LPTVAW; siccus estum P siccus aestum LTV auster ascius aestum A siccus es tum W.

On the one hand, the lemma is not Virgilian; on the other hand, the false attribution of the citation to Cicero seems due to some one's faulty memory. The item might therefore be tentatively referred to some Virgil-scholium where the meaning of 'austerus' was contrasted with that of e.g. 'severus'. But see Part I §39.

SALLUST

124 **Serpens: apud Virgilium genere masculino, apud Sallustium feminino** (Iug. 89) "neque serpens perniciosa". . (SE 565. Gloss. LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

aput urg gn masl aput sallust G; generi T; salustium PVC; feminini PTVC; pernitiosa PTV.

This item is from a scholium on some line of Virgil (e.g. Aen. 2, 214) where the gender of 'serpens' was defined, and where Sallust was quoted in illustration of the feminine. The words 'serpens perniciosa' are also quoted from Sallust by Charisius (Gram. Lat. I 552).

The citation is of interest because the passage of Sallust is under suspicion. It runs: *omnia . . . infesta serpentibus quarum vis sicuti omnium ferarum, inopia cibi acrior, ad hoc natura serpentium ipsa perniciosa, siti magis quam alia re acceditur.* Dietsch brackets the words 'natura serpentium ipsa perniciosa', and Serv. on Geo. 3, 434 quotes the subsequent words in this form: 'quod genus siti magis quam alia re acceditur'. So far as the MSS. of Sallust leads us, it is clear that the gender of 'serpens' was defined by 'quarum' and that 'perniciosa' did not refer to 'serpens' at all. Had the text of Sallust been indubitably sound we should either have regarded our present item as due to a gross misconstruing of

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Sallust or, taking it in conjunction with the phrase preserved by Charisius, we should have claimed the citation as a new fragment of Sallust. As the case stands, however, the item is commended to future editors of the *Bell. Iugur.*

Fessus: ad omnia refertur. Virgilius (Aen. 1, 178) “fessi rerum”; ideoque aliquotiens ‘inopes’; Sallustius (Hist. I frag. 128 Maur.) “fessus in Pamphyliam se recepit”. alias fessus ‘consilii incertus’. (FE 527. No label LPV)

pamphiam LPV; recepit LPV (cf. Serv.); alias consilii P¹; incertum LPV.

Excepting Lib., the only authority for this fragment is the scholium of Serv. on Aen. 8, 232:—‘Ter fessus valle resedit: egens consilii; Sallustius ‘fessus in P. se receperat’ Our item, apart from the new reading which is provides, is of interest since it comes from a longer scholium than Servius preserves, and it may even be that the preceding gloss (FE 526:—Fessus: fatigatus, lassus, labelled De Gls.) was part of the same scholium.

Cea: insula. Sallustius ait (Hist. II frag. 6) “Aristaeum primo insulam Ceam, relictā patria, coluisse”. (CE 2. No label LP)

iuristeum P aristeum L; insulam quam rel. LP; paria L (corrected by L²).

Whether these are the actual words of Sallust, or are the remodelled version of a scholiast at Geo. 1, 14 (Ceae) is not quite certain. For this fragment Maurenbrecher presents only ‘Apollinis filius et Cyrenes’; but he holds that Serv. at Geo. 1, 14 preserves some other Sallustian phrases (italicised in the following excerpt from Serv.): “Aristaeum invocat, id est *Appollinis et Cyrenes filium*, quem Hesiodus dicit Apollinem pastoralem. hic, ut etiam Sallustius docet, post laniatum a canibus Actaeonem filium *matris instinctu* Thebas reliquit et Ceam insulam tenuit primo, *adhuc hominibus vacuam*; postea, ea relictā, cum Daedalo ad Sardiniam *transitum fecit*.

Crocum: et neutro et masculino genere dicitur. Sallustius neutro (Hist. II 81) “in quo crocum dignitur”. (CR 228. No label LP)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

masculini P -linum L; generum L; salustius P; in qua: Serv.; crocam gig. P.

This fragment is cited by Serv. (Geo. 4, 182) and Nonius (III p. 202). The fact that Serv. quotes just as much as Lib., whereas Nonius gives a longer citation, points to the fact that our item has come by way of 'Abstrusa' from a Virgil-scholium (where the gender of the word was discussed), rather than from Festus by way of Abolita. Compare also Dub. Nom. 576, 5: crocum generis neutri; sed Macer Aemilius 'pallentesque crocos'.

128 Vis: plus significat quam multitudo. Sallustius (Hist. III 66) "qua tempestate vis piscium ponto erupit". (VI 364. No label LPTVC)

salustius LPTVC; qui LPTVC; uii piscium V.

A glance at Serv. on Aen. 4, 132 (vis plus est quam si diceret 'multitudo'; unde Sallustius 'qua temp. ex pon. v. p. er.') will suffice to show that the source of this item is very probably a Virgil-scholium.

129 Praevertimus: cum ipsi praeimus; praevertimus dum aliquid praemittimus. Sallustius (Hist. III 98 c) "neu praeverteret de se nuntios." (Appears only in PP)

desenutos G.

This item affords a new reading for this fragment which Maurenbrecher prints as 'celeritate praeverterent //// nuntios', reporting that there is room left for *four* letters of which the first may be D, B, P or R, and the last, E. Hauler suggested 'de re', which G does not confirm. The source seems to be a Virgil-scholium on Aen. 1, 317. Compare No. 222 which may be part of the same scholium.

130 "Sibila ora" (Virg. Aen. 2, 211): pro sibilant<ia, ut festinus pro festinans. Sallustius (frag. incert. 2) "cohortes festinas conposuerat". (SI 3. No label LP)

Sibilant pro sib. L.

The lemma indicates that this item comes from a scholium on Aen. 2, 211. There Serv. writes:—Sibila: id est sibilantia; nam participium est; cum enim nomen est 'sibilus' dicimus.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

The sole authority hitherto for this fragment was SD on Aen. 9, 488:—*Festina pro festinans, nomen pro participio. . . . Sallustius in secunda (-do?) ‘cohortes festinas composuerat’.*

Crede: confide. Sallustius (frag. incert. 7) “*virtuti satis credebant*”. (CR 78. No label LPTV)
virtutis LPT.

This fragment is attested by Serv. on Ecl. 2, 17:—*Ne crede: ne confide. Sallustius ‘virtuti satis credebant’, id est confidebant.* Dietsch however may be correct in suspecting that this fragment is only a corrupt version of Bell. Iugur. 106 (*virtuti suorum satis credere*). In any case the origin of our item in Virgil-scholia is beyond all reasonable doubt.

Trieres: naves. Sallustius (frag. incert. 11) “*dorso fluctus trieris adaequata*”. (TR 301. Gloss. LPVC; no label T)
naves salita as dorso T n. salutias V; adequatum LPTVC.

For this citation Lib. is the only evidence. The lemma-word is not Virgilian but almost any occurrence of ‘naves’ might be a suitable place for a scholium in which the Sallust-passage may have been cited.

Mandet: credat. Sallustius (frag. incert. 28) “*adcommo-
datum, mandatum credat*”. (MA 579. No label
LPTVC)

For this quotation Lib. again is the sole authority. Mauren-brecher emends to ‘*at cum mandatum credat*’. The item is perhaps from a scholium on Geo. 2, 50 (mandet); though it should be noticed that SD on Aen. 8, 506 (mandat) quotes Sallust’s use of the verb (Cat. 23, 5), and a scholium at that line may have given this additional citation from the same author.

SOLINUS

Nitela: Solinus (22, 5) “*nam praecipua viris gloria est in
armorum nitela*”. (NI 184. No label LPTVC. Appears
also in PP)

Nitela rex sol. G; es G; armorum tela LPTVC (not G).

Perhaps from a scholium on some part of 'nitet' or 'nitidus'. Note that the presence of this item in PP precludes the suggestion that the compiler of Lib. added this item as a result of his own reading.

STATIUS

135 Intempestivus: Statius (Ach. 1, 585) "in verbis intempestivus anhelet". (IN 1721. Gloss. LPT)

Interprestrius LP Interrestrius T; stant in LPT; intemprestribus LPT; anelet P anhalet L.

The alphabetical arrangement of Lib. shows clearly that the archetype had 'Intemp-' in the lemma. There is nothing to indicate whether the citation comes from a text of Statius directly, from Statius-scholia, or from Virgil-scholia. We may either regard the item as a part of the same scholium as No. 31 or attribute it to a scholium on Geo. 1, 247 (intempesta nox).

136 Thrysos: thyrsum genus cymbali in modum fenestrae quadratae factum, quod ab utraque manu tenetur et tam aperiendo quam etiam claudendo sonat. Graece enim fenestra 'thyrides' dicitur. Statius (Ach. 1, 617) "thyrsumque virentem armat" quia de lauro ornabantur quando eum cantabant. (TI 200. No label LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

Thyrsor L (not PTVC) Tirsum G (158, 5); cimbali TVG; fenestre LPT CG; quadrate LPCG; quadrefactum vel quod TV (-tam V); quod..... sonat G omits (but cf. 158, 4); apperieno T; festra LP; tyriden LPTVC tiidem G; tyrrumque P tirsumque G; de TV omit; eam G.

The scribe of G gives what seem to be not two separate items but two versions of this one. Thus 158, 4 stops before the Statius-citation while 158, 5 omits part of the preceding interpretation.

This item is too long for a marginal note in a Statius-MS. That it is not taken from a Statius-scholium is conclusively shown by the form of the lemma which agrees, not with the citation, but with Aen. 7, 390 (collis tibi sumere thrysos); and the 'eum' in the additional matter refers possibly to 'te' in Aen. 7, 391. It is reasonable therefore to suppose that this item is derived from a Virgil-scholium.

Scandebat: ascendebat, ut est illud (Stat. Ach. 1, 619)
 “scandebat roseo medii fastigia caeli luna iugo”. (SC
 22. Gloss. LPTVC).

scandaebat C; illut C; celiluna C celluna T.

The form of the lemma seems to be confirmed by that of the interpretation, though both of them may have been influenced by the citation. This form is not Virgilian; but supported by the Abstrusa-item (167, 21) ‘scandit: ascendit’, we might refer our item to a scholium on Aen. 2, 237 (scandit fatalis machina).

Moribundo ore: morti proximo. Statius (Theb. 9, 349)
 “ultimus ille sonus moribundo emersit ab ore”. (MO
 425. No label LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

statius T stant LPC stat VG; solus LPTVC; dimisit LPTVC emisit G.

The lemma-phrase is not Virgilian but the item may be from a scholium on e.g. Geo. 3, 488 (moribunda). From Serv. on Aen. 10, 341 we may see that the word ‘moribundus’ could give rise to a long scholium; and the original form of our item may have been:—ut Statius “ult. ille s. mor. em. ab ore”, id est morti proximo.

Neverat: neerat, filaverat. Statius (Theb. 9, 691) “hoc neverat unum mater opus”. (NE 444. No label LPTVCAW)

stant LPTVCAW; ater LPCV; autem opus T uter opus AW.

The lemma-word occurs at Aen. 10, 818, from a scholium on which line our item may be derived.

Exerto: enudato. Statius (Theb. 9, 736) “tunc vero exerto circumvolat igneus arcu”. (EX 502. No label LPTV)
 Exertos L²; enudatos LP enudatus TV; stat LPTV; exercito LPTV; igneo LPTV; artu TV.

The lemma-form is not Virgilian but may be due to the influence of the citation. Other parts of the participle are Virgilian, though Serv. (on Aen. 1, 492 Exertae: nudatae) is no more conclusive evidence for origin in Virgil-scholia than the Abolita-gloss (70, 43 Exertus: nudatus vel apertus) is for deriving the item from ‘Abolita’.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

141 Perfossam: perforatam. Statius (Theb. 9, 767) “perfossus telo niveam gemis, *⟨A⟩eole*, frontem”. (PE 727. Gloss. LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

Perfossa LPTVC (not G); perforatum TV; stant LPTVCG; perfossam LPTVCG and MSS. of Statius (corrected by Bentley); teloniu eam G tele niveam LPVC teleniveam T; genis C inemis TV.

Possibly from a scholium on Aen. 11, 10 (perfoſſum).

142 Amyclis: Virgilius (Aen. 10, 564) “et tacitis regnavit Amyclis”. nominative Statius interdum (Theb. 9, 769) “virides non excipietis Amyclae”. (AM 196. No label LPTVAW)

et tacius T; regnabit LPV; nomina LPTVAW.

The words ‘nominative’ and ‘interdum’ are not quite natural if this item came from Statius-scholia, but are suitable if it came from a scholium on the line of Virgil which is cited. On this line of Virgil, Serv. quotes Lucilius and Juvenal in illustration.

143 “Lucrabere” (?Stat. Theb. 9, 779): lucraberis. (LU 97. No label LP)

lucrav- LP (twice). cf. No. 144.

144 “Lucrabere (?Stat. Theb. 9, 779): lucraberis; producta ‘e’ lucraverunt. (LU 98. No label LP)

lucrav- LP (twice).

These two items are not to be regarded as two separate scholia, but rather as the results of careless dittography. They are possibly derived from a scholium on Geo. 1, 228 (aspernabere) where Statius was cited for a verbal form analogous to the one used by Virgil.

145 Hiscere: findere, aperire. Statius (Theb. 9, 859) “olor cupid hiscere ripam”. (HI 196. No label LPVAW)

stant LV; stan tolor P; cupid scipe V scife LPA cupisci feripam W.

Virgil has ‘hisco’ only at Aen. 3, 314; and if this item is from a scholium on that line, Statius was cited for a different meaning of the verb. It should also be noted that Serv. on Aen. 1, 123 (fatiscunt) writes: hiscere autem aperiri.

Nervi: generis masculini. Statius (Theb. 9, 868) “nervique obliqua sonori vincla secat” cuspis. (NE 402. No label LP)

genus LP; stant LP; obliquas honori P obliquus hono L; segat LP.

The additional word ‘cuspis’ is to be found in the preceding verse of Statius. The lemma-form is not Virgilian; but that is no insuperable objection to deriving the item from a scholium on Geo. 4, 313 (nervo).

Tempe: locus quidam frigidus, nebulis semper tectus, in valle cuius cacumina saxosa et alta multum, puto. Statius (Theb. 10, 84-98)

- 84 “Stat super occiduae nebulosa cubilia noctis
- 85 Aethiopasque alios, nulli penetrabilis astro
Lucus iners, subterque cavis grave rupibus antrum
It vacuum in montem, qua desidis atria Somni
Securumque larem segnis Natura locavit.
- Limen opaca Quies et pigra Oblivio servant
- 90 <Et numquam vigili torpens Ignavia vultu. >
Otia vestibulo pressisque Silentia pinnis
Muta sedent abiguntque truces a culmine ventos
Et ramos errare vetant et murmura demunt
Alitibus. Non hic pelagi, licet omnia clament
- 95 Litora, non ullus caeli fragor; ipse profundis
Vallibus effugiens speluncae proximus amnis
Saxa inter scopulosque iacet; nigrantia circum
- 98 Armenta, omne solo recubat pecus.” (TE 168. No label LP. Appears also in PP)

frigidas LP (G omits); super tectis G; statuis PG statis L. 85 aezyopasque LP etiopasque G; 86 locus L lucus G astrologus P; 87 id LP id est G; omni LPG; 88 securus securumque G; locabit G; 89 opacaque quies LPG; oblibia LP oblivia MSS. of Statius; 90 LPG omit; 92 abeuntque LP (not G); culumine utus LP culumne venturum G; 93 murmurare LP; 94 non his LP; hic pes lagi G; 95 lit. nullus G; non nullus c. frigor P; pragor L; profundus LPG; 96 omnis LP (not G); 97 scopulosque LPG; iacet LPG (and some MSS. of Statius), tacet: other MSS. of Statius; 98 armentia LP.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

The length of this citation suggests that it originated in a text of Statius which some glossary-compiler has copied. The nearest parallel for the length of the quotation is SD on Geo. 1,375 where seven lines of Varro are cited. Yet this passage of Statius was possibly used in a scholium on Geo. 2, 469 as a description of Tempe.

148 Lampade: feminino genere. Statius (Theb. 10, 121) "nec lampade clara". (LA 246. No label LPTVAWD)

Lampades L; genere extant nec LPTVAD gere extant nec W; clare T.

The grammatical comment is illustrated by Statius; but surely it was not the Statius-passage which gave rise to the note, since such a comment on such a line would be needless. Consequently we derive this item from a scholium on Aen. 9, 535 where the gender of the word (lampada) is not defined.

149 Vidui clavi: desolati gubernaculi navis. Poeta Statius (Theb. 10, 183) "subit ad vidui moderamina clavi". (VI 125. No label LPTVCAW)

gubernatula T; stant LPCAW n. peta stant T poeta subita stant vid. V; subita vid. LPTC.

The lemma-phrase is not Virgilian. There are therefore two alternative explanations: (1) the item is a recast version of a Statius-scholium or (2) it is taken from some Virgilian scholium in which the phrase of Statius was explained. In his note on Aen. 8, 571 (viduasset) Serv. points out that 'viduus Apollo' in Horace is incongruous; and another scholiast, discussing the various meanings of the verb and its cognates at this line, might have cited and explained this passage of Statius.

150 Pecoroso vere: verno fecundo. Statius (Theb. 10, 229) "cum fetura gregem pecoroso vere novavit". (PE 34. Ciceronis LPCAWD; no label TV)

Pecorose LP -sae T Pecora severe C Pecoro severe WD pecorosevere A; verne C; faecundos tantum fetus TV stant cum LPCAWD; fetara LAW.

The label of the MSS. should refer to PE 29-33 (which give synonyms of 'peccavit'). The lemma-phrase again is not Virgilian; yet the item may come, not from a Statius-scholium,

but from a long scholium on Geo. 3, 64 (pecuaria). If the item of the St. Gall-glossary (Pecoratus: abundans pecoribus) comes from 'Abstrusa', we could take it as an additional indication that various cognate words were discussed in a scholium on the suggested line of Virgil, just as the cognates of 'lactentia' were discussed in a scholium on Geo. 1, 315.

Marcor: defectus quidam. Statius (Theb. 10, 269) "cernitis expositas turpi marcore cohortes". (MA 768. No label LPTVC)

stant LPTC (not V); coortes LT.

The lemma-word is not Virgilian.

Dedecui: dehonestavi. Statius (Theb. 10, 339-340) "fidus-que sacerdos, si non dedecui tua iussa". (DE 232. No label LPTVAWD)

Dedecuit PW; stat LPAWD; dehonestata iusta fidesque TV; sacerdos T; sinon d TV (omitting the remainder); dedecuit LP.

This item may come from a scholium on some line of Virgil containing 'dedecus' (e.g. Aen. 10, 681) or a related word. The Statius-scholium (of Lactantius Placidus) however gives:—si monitus tuos non indecenter effeci sive non dehonestavi.

"**Ditia dona**" (Stat. Theb. 10, 344): ditissima dona. (DI 1173. No label LP)

If not a short Statius-scholium or a marginal note, this item may be derived from a scholium on Aen. 1, 343 (ditissimus); whence possibly No. 178 also comes.

Absiliunt: descendunt. Statius (Theb. 10, 374-375) "ab-siliunt nubes et fulgore claro astra patent". (AB 351. Gloss. PTV)

L omits entirely.

No part of the lemma-verb is to be found in Virgil. But cf. Aen. 10, 453 (desiluit). The Statius-scholium gives:—
Absiliunt: crepitant.

Lea: leaena. Statius (Theb. 10, 414) "ut lea, quam saevo fetam pressere cubili venantes". (LE 2. No label LPVAWD)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

leena P leana V; stant LPVAWD; petam PVD pecum LAW; pressare LPVAWD.

‘Lea’ is not a Virgilian form, but ‘leaena’ is. Serv. on Ecl. 2, 63 points out that ‘leaena’ is a similar form to ‘dracaena’. Philargyrius cites Plautus for ‘feminam leonem’ and Varro for ‘lea’. Similarly Statius may have been cited by a scholiast at that place (or at Geo. 3, 245) in illustration of the non-Virgilian form.

156 Luctificis: luctum faciens. Statius (Theb. 10, 552) “at tuba luctificis pulsat clangoribus urbem”. (LU 129. No label LPTV)

paciens T patiens V; stant ad LPTV; clamoribus LPTV.

The lemma-form is probably due to the citation, as may be seen from the interpretation. The item is perhaps from a scholium on Aen. 7, 324 (luctificam).

157 Flagrat: Statius (Theb. 10, 605) “fatidicum sorbens vultu flagrante vaporem”. (FL 102. No label LPV)

Stant LPV.

We may derive the item, if not from a Statius-scholium, from a scholium on any of the Virgilian lines where parts of this verb are to be found. Possibly FL 101 (Flagrat: verberat, labelled De Gls) and FL 103 (Flagrat: ardet = Abstrusa) were originally parts of the same scholium.

158 Limen: campus, ostii principium. Statius (Theb. 10, 652) “inmensae reserato limine portae”. (LI 305. No label LPTV)

prin. sunt inmense LPT.

The first part of the interpretation is not apposite to the Statius-citation. The item may have come from a scholium on any line of Virgil containing ‘limen’, where various meanings were enumerated and illustrated.

159 Crinalem cerastim: serpentem de capite pendentem. Poeta (Stat. Theb. 11, 65) “crinalem attollit longo stridore cerasten”. (CR 193. Gloss. LPT; no label V)

Crinalem PTV Crinumlen L; attollet LPTV; cerastim LPTV.

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

The lemma-phrase is not Virgilian; yet the item may have come from a scholium on Aen. 7, 403 (crinales) or Aen. 11, 576 (crinali) or, most likely of all, from a scholium relating to Allecto (Aen. 7, 346: caeruleis unum de crinibus anguem).

Acerbus: asper, iram movens. Poeta (Stat. Theb. 12, 75) “et ingratum regni mihi munus acerbas”. (AC 114. No label LPTVAW)

ira TA; mov. potra W; regnum LPTVAW; mun. acerbus LPTAW acerbum V.

Either from a Virgil-scholium on some part of ‘acerbus’ or on Aen. 11, 407 (acerbat); but scarcely from a marginal note to Statius. The Statius-scholium merely gives:—Acerbas: acerbum facis.

SULPICIUS SEVERUS

Interdius: die. (Sulp. Sev. dial. I 19, 4) “cum neque nocte neque interdius ille ⟨aquarius⟩ cessaret operator”. (IN 1769. No label LP)

noctu Sulpius; interdiu Sulp; operator cessarit LP.

Though the lemma-form is not Virgilian, this item is not of so distinctive a nature that it could not have appeared in some Virgilian scholium.

Turrita: in modum turris facta; ut (Sulp. Sev. dial. III 8, 4) “politissimis saxis moles turrita surrexerat”. (TU 215. No label LP)

sacis mollis P; molles L; surrexit LP.

Probably from a scholium on Aen. 6, 785. Notice that in an Abstrusa MS. ‘Turrita’ appears as a lemma without interpretation (after 187, 33). Compare also Dub. Nom. 583, 30:—Moles generis feminini ut Severus ‘moles turrita surr.’

TERENCE

Commeritus: qui delinquit ut (Ter. And. 139) “quid ⟨conmerui aut peccavi, pater⟩ ?”. (CO 397. Gloss. L; no label P)

delinquit LP.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

This curtailed item is to be combined with CO 1167 (Conmerui: aut peccavi pa[ri]ter). The two items together are word for word part of the scholium of SD on Aen. 4, 335. The significance and explanation of these items and their corruptions will be found in Part I §13. DCT is less close to our item than is Serv.; for we find: 'commerui' minoris culpae est, 'peccavi' multo minoris vel levioris.

164 Confieri: pro fieri adiecta praepositione, hoc ⟨loco⟩ Vergilius (Aen. 4, 116). Terentius vero (Adel. 946) "hoc confit quod volo" et (And. 167) "spero confore", pro fore. (CO 887. Placidi LPTVA)
confidit quod L; confero profero LP.

The label attached to this item is very probably a mistake; for nothing corresponding to this item is found in the Roman MSS. of Placidus (cf. Part. I §21). But whether the item be Placidus, or one which properly comes within the scope of this treatise, it must, as the interpretation shows, have arisen from a Virgil-scholium on Aen. 4, 116 (where Serv. writes:—confieri: 'con' abundat). It is interesting to note that DCT on And. 167 gives:—Confore: confieri, perfici; and in illustration of the meaning cites Aen. 4, 115-116.

165 Differat: in diversum ferat. Terentius (And. 407) "orationem sperat invenisse ⟨se⟩ qua differat te". (DI 226. No label LPTV)
terentius T; qua LPTV qui MSS. of Ter.; difert a te L; te TV omit.

This part of the lemma-verb is not to be found in Virgil but may be due to the citation. The item may be from a scholium on Geo. 4, 144 (where SD writes:—Distulit: in diversum locum tulit) or on Geo. 3, 197 (differt). DCT gives:—differat: disturbet et in diversum ferat; and cites Geo. 3, 197 in illustration.

166 Discessio: divortium. Terentius (And. 568) "si eveniat, quod di prohibeant, discessio". (DI 664. No label LPTV)
divorcium V; veniant LPTV; prohibeent T.

The lemma-word is not Virgilian; but the item may be part of a scholium on some occurrence of 'discessus' or any part of 'discedo' e.g. on Aen. 6, 464 or Aen. 8, 215. DCT is silent.

Lactare: circum^{venire}, fraude vocare. Terentius (And. 648) "nisi me lactasses amantem". (LA 188. No label LPTV)

fraude circum V; terrentius L; nisi LPTV and MSS. of Ter.; Dziatzko emends to 'ni'; lactasse LPT lactasset V.

Almost certainly from a scholium on Geo. 1, 315. Compare No. 205, where the scholium is reconstructed. cf. 168.

Oblectatur: quasi cum lacte, cum fraude, ut Terentius (And. 648) "nisi me lactasses amantem"; unde et oblectare dictum est. (OB 215. Placidi LTV; no label PC)

There are several sources which might be suggested for this item: (1) If the label given by some MSS. is correct, we might regard the item as a new Placidus-gloss (though the Roman MSS. of Placidus have nothing similar). Even so, the ultimate source might be Virgil-scholia (cf. Part I §21). (2) The label may be a mistake for 'Isidori'; for in Is. Etym. 10, 199 we have the same words, except that the lemma is 'Oblectator'. Such a confusion of labels however is not well attested. (3) If the label is a mistake for 'De Gl's', we should derive the item from a scholium on Geo. 1, 315 (cf. No. 205)—the source whence Isidore may have derived his item. The confusion between the labels 'Placidi' and 'De Gl's' is well established (cf. Part I §21). The similarity between this item and DCT (Lactare est inducere in aliquam voluntatem a laciendo; unde et oblectare dicitur) is not striking and cannot be regarded as evidence that this item came from Terence-scholia.

Duint: dent. Terentius (And. 666) "at tibi di dignum factis exitium duint". (DU 86. Gloss. LPTV)

terrentius T; ad tibi T a tibi L; dii LPTV.

This lemma-form is not in Virgil, but the Terence-scholia at this place are silent. It is possible that the Terence-cita-

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

tion was used in illustration of such forms as 'ausim' by a Virgil-scholiast (e.g. at Ecl. 3, 32). Affatim (C. G. L. iv 508, 26:—Duent: dent, tribuant) cannot be adduced in support of the Virgilian origin of this item; for the Affatim-gloss may be not 'Abstrusa' but a lost Terence-gloss from 'Abolita'.

170 **Tot:** ad numerum refertur. Terentius (Heaut. 634) "tot peccata in hac re ostendis". (TO. 215. No label LPTVC) terentius C; pectata T (not V); inacre L; ostendit T (not V).

The interpretation seems unnecessary unless we suppose that 'tot' was distinguished in meaning from 'tantus'. No one will deny that such an item may possibly have come from Virgil-scholia.

171 **Ob:** propter. Terentius (Heaut. 956) "quodnam ob factum?". (OB 3. No label LPTV. Appears also in PP) terentius T tertis obfueris prpr G.

From a scholium on Aen. 1, 233 where SD writes:—potest 'ob' et 'ante' intellegi, aut 'ob' 'propter'; Terentius 'quodnam ob factum?'.

172 **Grando:** a rusticis calamitas appellatur; unde et Terentius (Eun. 79) "sed ecce ipsa egreditur nostri fundi calamitas". (GR 66. No label LPV)

ipse creditur LP (not V); nri fundi P nisi fundi L (either from 'nsi' i.e. 'nostri' in Visigothic script, or from 'ni').

DCT gives:—*Nostri fundi calamitas: proprie. Calamitatem rustici grandinem dicunt, quod comminuat calamus, id est culmum ac segetem.* The similarity between the Lib. item and DCT is interesting, but is not conclusive evidence that the item came from Terence-scholia; for a scholiast on Virgil at Geo. 1, 449 (horrida grando) might very possibly have had a similar note. Indeed we may fairly inquire whether such a note was not more likely to originate in a scholium on Geo. 1, 449 and thence be transferred to Terence-scholia. Certain it is that the note is not immediately apposite to the text of Terence; it is equally certain that a Virgil-scholiast wrote a similar note (e.g. SD on Geo. 1, 151:—Robigo

autem genus est vitii quo culmi pereunt, quod a rusticis calamitas dicitur). After all, the parallel with DCT is not very striking or convincing.

Cuium: cuius. Terentius (Eun. 321) “qui(d)? virgo cuia est?”; quia veteres pronominibus universis addebant genus. (CU 37. Gloss. LPTV)

terrentius LT; quirgo TV; cula LPTV; qui veteres L; universi TV.

Serv. on Ecl. 3, 1 writes:—antiqui dicebant sicut ‘meus, mea, meum’ sic ‘cuius, cuia, cuius’. Terentius ‘quid? virgo cuia est?’. BS give:—Cuium: pro cuius antiqua locutio veterum qui cuium neutro, cuius masculino, cuia feminino dixerunt; nos ‘cuius’ tribus generibus dicimus (cf. also Philargyrius). There is no doubt then that the item could have come from a Virgil-scholium; and the form of the lemma resolves every doubt. From the same scholium there probably also came CU 38:—Cuium pecus: antiqua declinatione, cuius masculino, cuia autem feminino; sic possessiva nomina declinantur (cf. BS cited above).

Em: ecce. Terentius (Eun. 459) “em alterum; ex homine hunc tantum credas?”. (HE 91. Gloss. LPVA; no label WD)

Hem LPVAWD; hecce LPV; hem PV; balterum V; ex nomine V; tantum credas LPVAWD natum dicas MSS. of Terence.

This item was apparently to be found also in PP; but the readings of G are no longer legible. The new readings which Lib. affords are worth noting and are not unsuitable to the context. ‘Tantum’ might be explained as a corruption of ‘natum’, but ‘credas’ cannot be anything but a variant. Since this item could have come from a scholium on many lines of Virgil, e.g. Ecl. 1, 67, the readings may have only the authority of the scholiast’s memory.

Sceleratum: grammatici dicunt sceleratum esse in quo scelus fit, scelestum per quem fit, scelerosum qui facit. Terentius (Eun. 643) “ubi ego *illum* scelerosum misera atque impium inveniam?”. (Appears in PP only)

ubi ergo G; adque G.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

The item is probably not due to an annotation of a text of Terence; for the lemma seems to refer to Geo. 2, 256. From the same or from a similar source came Is. Diff. I 507:—*Inter sceleratum, scelestum, et scelerosum: grammatici dicunt sceleratum illum esse in quo fit scelus; ut Cicero 'O te scelerate qui subactus et prostitutus es; scelestum autem per quem fit; ut Terentius 'scelestata, ovem lupo commisisti'; scelerosum qui facit; ut idem 'ego illum scelerosum misera nolens pertuli'. sed haec auctores non usquequa custodiunt.* DCT gives:—*scelerosus est multorum, scelestus unius; and:—scelerosus proprie auctor est sceleris, sceleratus in quo scelus sit constitutum aut commissum.* In view of the form of the lemma and the parallelism of the Isidore passage, neither of these notes of DCT is close enough to our item to warrant the suggestion that our item is derived from Terence-scholia.

Terence, Eun. 763 is cited in No. 96.

176 Dicabo: dabo. Terentius (Phor. 62) “hanc operam tibi dico”, id est do; a passivo participium dictus facit, non dicatus. (DI 52. Gloss. TV; no label LPAWD)

tibi dicabo T; est dia passius L est dia passio P est di a passivo AWC; item dicor diceris is passo participio TV (inpassivo V); participiam L; facti LPAW fiati D.

In this item again, the lemma points, not to the Terence-citation, but very definitely to a line of Virgil (Aen. 1, 73). SD had access to a similar scholium, since he writes: *alii 'dicabo' 'dabo' accipiunt. Terentius 'iam hanc operam tibi dico', id est 'do'; sicuti ab eo quod est 'dico' participium a passivo dictus facit.* Neither in SD nor in our item does the distinction between ‘dicere’ and ‘dicare’ appear clearly or accurately; and that failing is due probably to some obscurity in the common source. DCT gives:—*plus est 'dico' quam 'do'; dicatur perpetuo, datur ad tempus; and is obviously not related to our item.*

177 Ruit: et patientis est et facientis. Virgilius ut (Aen. 1, 83) “qua data porta ruunt”, Terentius (Adel. 319) “ceteros ruerem, agerem, raperem, tunderem, et prosternerem”. (RU 111. No label LPVC. Appears also in PP)

utque data LPCG ut que V; portarunt G; terent LPVC; alios raperent ruerem tunderem et pro. LPVCG.

The label De Glis is found affixed to an item which is clearly an offshoot of this one:—Ruerem: tunderem, et prosternerem (RU 72). The present item, certainly not derived from the notes in the margin of a text of Terence, is to be regarded as part of a scholium on Geo. 1, 105, for example, where Serv. points out that 'ruit' in that line is 'agentis'. DCT gives:—ruerem: activam vim habet; and cites Sallust, Horace, and Virgil (Geo. 3, 255).

Dis: dives. Terentius si⟨c⟩ (Adel. 770) "dis quidem esses Demea". (DI 362. No label LPTV)

Diis LPTV; terrentius T; diis LPTV; esse L; Demeta LPTV.

Wessner (Corp. Gloss. Lat. I p. 378) argues that the word 'si' in this item is due to the compiler of the supposed parent-glossary of PP and Lib. who used the marginal notes in a MS. of Terence and failed to understand the change of speaker indicated by 'Sy⟨rus⟩'. But such a conclusion is more ingenious than sound. Even supposing that 'si' is a misreading of an indication of the slave's name, all that can be inferred is that some one or other misunderstood it; but the identity of the person is not thereby settled, since even a Virgil-scholiast may have been guilty. Furthermore, the 'si', if it is anything more than a slip on the part of the scribe of the archetype of Lib., may only be due to some one's faulty memory; and the faulty memory may have been that of a Virgil-scholiast. Were it not for the fact that '-et-' may be a mistranscription for '-e-' by the scribe of the archetype of Lib. (cf. Lindsay, Palaeog. Lat. I 48), we might be inclined to counter Wessner's argument by suggesting that the reading 'Demeta' is due to the compiler of a variorum-commentary on Virgil who was more closely acquainted with Ecl. 3, 1 (Damota) than with Terence. (Such a confusion of names can be paralleled in item No. 37; and from similar causes, Dr. T. E. Page writes Ascanius Pedianus, for Asconius, in his introductory note to Ecl. IV, and Daphnis, for Gallus, in his summary of Ecl. X 9-30.) It is in place, however, to suggest that the item comes from a scholium on Aen. 1, 343 (ditissimus) and that No. 153 and DI 361 (Dis: dives, singulari

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

numero, labelled De Gl*s*) were originally parts of the same scholium. DCT gives:—ab eo quod est dis ditis dites facit, ab eo quod est dives divitis divites; but affords no real indication of the source of our item.

TROGUS

179 *Consulere: aliquando in malum, ut est illud Trogi in libro sexagesimo secundo de Phraata rege* (Just. 42, 5, 4) “cum multa crudeliter consuleret in exilium a populo suo pellitur”. (CO 1616. Gloss. LPTV)
secunda T; Fraata LP Fruata TV; consulueret LPTV; exilio LPTV.

Possibly from a scholium on Aen. 12, 21 (*consulere*). It is not probable that this single item came from a marginal note in a copy of Trogus or of his epitomizer Justinus.

VARRO

180 “Frontem caper⟨r⟩atam” (Varro Men. 134): aut tristem aut superciliosam ac minacem. (FR 227. Gloss. LAW; no label P)
superciliosu P.

The lemma-phrase seems to be just a hasty excerpt from Varro (‘quin mihi caperratam tuam frontem, Strobile, omittis?’), and is perhaps from some Virgil-scholium on an occurrence of ‘caper’.

181 *Vannus: instrumentum de vimine factum in modum scuti necessarium tempore messis; vas purgatorium est et mundandi farris instrumentum. legitur et vallus.* Varro (Men. 578^b) “hanc festuculae pallio amicta⟨m⟩ vallus mitis iacta venti ventilat lenem auram crassasque aufert paleae tunicas cortices”. (VA 149. Gloss. LPTVCA)

Vannus argumentum LPTVCA; de minime L; furris T; vallos T; hunc L; festuculo LPTVC (corrected by Buecheler); pallio LAW omit; amicta PTVCA amita L (corrected by Buech.); valus T; iacta LPTVCA; venti talem ad LTVA ventilem ad PC (emended by Buech.); aurem L; crassasque LPC oras sasquae T orassas que V; ut fere P ut ferre C ut fert L uafert TV (corrected by Buech.); pale et unicos PC palea et unicos L polea et unicus T polea unicus V.

For this fragment of Varro, Lib. is our only authority. The citation is used only to illustrate an alternative reading of the lemma-word; and we naturally turn to Geo. 1, 166 as the most likely source for the item. There Serv. also uses a garbled citation of Varro to defend the same alternative reading:—legimus tamen et vallis secundum Varronem ‘hanc fisticula pollio mysta vallis’ quod idem nihilominus significat.

BS give the same general information as our item:—Vannus: alveus ex viminibus factus, corio desuper tectus, quo in areis rustici utuntur, discernens fruges et paleas instrumentum purgationis est.

Sinus: sinum vas fuit antiquitus; tamen Virgilius (Ecl. 7, 33) “sinum lactis et haec te liba, Priape, quotannis expectare sat est”. Varro quidem dixit (Vit. Pop. Rom. I) “tribus hunc a Romanis nominibus vocitari; primo lepestam, deinde galeolam, tertio sinum; pro quibus nunc acratoforo(n) nominant iuxta Graecum”; (sed etiam masculino dicitur) nam Plautus (Curcul. 82) “eine hic (cum vino) sinus fertur?”. (SI 502. No label LP. Appears also in PP)

vasui G; urg G; hec te priappe G; quod annis LPG; expectares adest L expectaris ut est P expectarsatest G; vocari P; lepiscam LP lepriscam G; galenum LPG; agrata foro P acrata forum G; nominat LP (not G); Plaustus LP; sine G.

This item (like No. 111) is derived from a scholium on Ecl. 7, 33 where SD writes:—Sinum lactis: sinus genus est vasis; Varro de Vita Populi Romani ‘aut lepestam aut galeolam aut sinum dicebant; tria enim (haec similia sunt) pro quibus nunc acratoforon dicitur’ Priscian affords a passage (Gramm. Lat. II 262) which is similar to our item and longer than Serv.:—Varro de Vita Populi Romani libro I ‘ubi erat vinum in mensa positum aut galeole aut sinum’; Virgilious in bucolico ‘sinum lactis . . . quotannis’; sed hoc etiam masculino quidam protulerunt; Plautus in Curculione ‘hic cum vino sinus fertur’.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

183 Kalva: *κρανίόν* vocatur, licet Gellius et Varro 'kalvariam' dicant; nam calvariae plurale est, kalvaria singulare. (KA 38., Gloss. LP)

Kalvus LP; licet Caelio LP.

This item is very similar to a passage of Caper (Gramm. Lat. VII 100): *Calva κρανίόν* vocatur, licet Gellius et Varro calvariam dicant; nam calvariae plurale est, calvae vero ossa, quae sunt et singulariter calva. The label of the MSS. (if correct), the divergence of our item from the Caper-passage and the lack of sufficient evidence for the direct use of Caper by Lib., all point to the fact that the item is not an excerpt, pure and simple, from Caper. May it be from a scholium on Aen. 1, 720 (where Serv. has a long note on *Venus Calva*)?

Note also Part I §11, and item No. 231.

VIRGIL

184 Culex (= Is. 12, 8, 13) + de quo quidam (Cul. 413) "parve culex, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti". (CU 53. No label LP)

custus L; tibi plura m. LP.

We need not suppose that the compiler of 'Abstrusa' had access to the minor poems. Donatus (Vit. Verg. 63) quotes the last two lines of the 'Culex'; and our citation was probably derived from the *Vita Vergili* prefixed to the commentary from which 'Abstrusa' was constructed.

185 "Ingratae urbi" (Ecl. 1, 34): quo⟨niam⟩ parvi aestiment urbani quae rusticis magna constant. "non unquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat" (Ecl. 1, 34-5); quoniam maiorem praestitit fructum. (IN 877. No label LPVAW)

extimentur vani LP extinentur vanique V; rustici V; constat L; numquam LPVAW; michi V; destram LP; redebat P reddebat LVAW; maior est praestitis LP; maiore praestiti V.

This item is really two separate scholia on adjacent lines of Virgil, carelessly fused. For the first part, compare Philargyrius: *vel quia parva aestimant quae rusticis magna constant.*

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Nais: genus herbae. Virgilius (Ecl. 2, 46) "tibi candida Nais pallentes violas". (NA 21. No label LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

aerbe L erbe P erue G; tiui G; violatus T.

This absurd interpretation may be due to the compiler of 'Abstrusa' who misread a note on 'violas' or 'papavera' (Ecl. 2, 47) as if it referred to Nais.

Nuces: cuncta poma quae textu clauduntur nuces dicuntur; ut Virgilius (Ecl. 2, 52) "castaneasque nuces". istic habentur in hortis. (NU 23. Gloss. LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

que textu G quae extu LT que extu PC; claudentur PC; istic hab. in hortis G omits; stic habantur PC; ortis P ortes C.

Compare Serv. at this line of Virgil:—bene speciem addidit dicens 'castaneas'; nam nuces generaliter dicuntur omnia tecta corio duriore, ut avellanae . . . sicut e contra poma dicuntur omnia molliora. By 'istic' Italy presumably is meant, and the scholium from which our item came was therefore not written in Italy.

"Torvae bovis" (Geo. 3, 51): terribilis vaccae; ut (Ecl. 2, 63) "torva leaena". (TO 106. No label LP)

bobes terribiles LP.

From a scholium on Geo. 3, 51 where Serv. writes:—Torvae: terribilis. Compare also Is. Et. 10, 269, derived from a similar scholium.

Incertas umbra(s): motu arborum inconstantes, ut (Ecl. 5, 5) "<incertas> Zephyris motantibus umbra(s)". (IN 304. Placidi LPVA)

Increta sunt ubera L; Incretas P; aut L; mutantibus LP.

The label is probably wrong. In the Roman MSS. of Placidus there is no gloss at all akin to this. Furthermore, BS afford us a definite parallel:—sub divo, sub motu arborum inconstantes. The item therefore is best regarded as a gloss of 'Abstrusa' derived from a Virgil-scholium, and the label as a slip for De Glis.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

190 Invidit: ut (Ecl. 7, 58) “pampineas invidit”. (IN 1985. Gloss LP)

piam pineas LP.

Clearly this line of the Eclogues was cited in a scholium elsewhere, probably at Aen. 11, 42 where Serv. writes:—‘tene invidit Fortuna mihi?’: ut ‘Liber pampineas invidit collibus umbras’.

191 Cotis: dignitas corporis. Virgilius (Ecl. 8, 43) “nunc scio quid sit amor duris in cotibus”. (CO 2401. Gloss. LPTVA)

quod sit TV; nudis LPTVA; quotibus L.

The interpretation may be just an ignorant remark found in the margin of a text; but it may be part of a scholium which read:—‘Cotibus, saxis; cutis, dignitas corporis’. There is a third possibility. Philargyrius gives us at this place:—in cotibus, id est *lecib*; diminutive coticula facit. Now if the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ had before him a scholium similar to this, he might take ‘coticula’ as ‘cuticula’; and if ‘cotibus’ itself, as in Philargyrius, had only a vernacular interpretation he would invent some Latin interpretation suggested by ‘cuticula’, and write ‘dignitas corporis’.

192 Ulva: herba palustris. Virgilius (Ecl. 8, 87) “propter aquae rivum viridi procumbit in ulva”. (UL 85. No label LPTVC)

aquerium PC aquaereum L aquae erium T aquam erium V; ulna P ulno C.

SD (at Aen. 2, 135) and Abolita (194, 46) give:—Ulva: herba palustris; but such coincidences are of no significance.

193 In numerum: *<in ordinem vel>* ad modulos. sic alibi ait (Ecl. 9, 45) “numeros memini”. (IN 2033. No label LPV)

alibi ad num. LPV; meminisse V nemini L.

Probably taken from a scholium on Ecl. 6, 27, where Serv. writes:—in numerum ludere: id est saltare ad modum rhythmi et cantilena. Since the meaning of ‘in numerum’ in that line would, perhaps, be open to various interpretations I have

ventured to regard Lib. IN 2034 (In numerum: in ordinem) as part of the same scholium and have incorporated it with the present item.

(H)ibiscus: genus virgulti. Virgilius (Ecl. 10, 71) “et gracili fiscellam texit *(h)ibisco*”. (IB 21. No label LPV)

gracilis L.

If IB 22 (Hibiscus: genus virgulti quod pastores pro flagellis utuntur) was originally derived from the same scholium, we might refer both items to Ecl. 2, 30 where Philargyrius writes:—Hibisco, id est genus virgulti quo pastores flagellant pecus.

“*Chaoniam pingui glande(m)*” (Geo. 1, 8). (CA 257. Gloss. LP)

This item is the mere lemma of a scholium which can be reconstructed from several items in Lib. (CA 257, 259, 260, and PA 304). BS (Geo. 1, 8) run:—*Chaoniam: regio est in Epiro ubi Iuppiter praecipue colitur; quercus autem arbor est in Iovis tutella ex qua glandes nascebantur, quibus homines vescebantur antequam essent fruges inventae.* Parallel to this, the reconstructed scholium would read:—*Chaoniam pingui glandem* (=CA 257): *Chaonia regio in Epiro <est> ubi templum Dodonaei Iovis fuisse dicitur* (=CA 260). ‘*Chaonio portu’ <alibi> Virgilius ‘portuque subimus Chaonio’* (=CA 259). *prius autem quam panis usus est, antiqui homines oleribus sive glande vixerunt; sicut et poeta ait ‘mortales primi ructabant gutture glandem’; tantum enim pomis arborum et oleribus alebantur sicut animalia herbis* (=PA 304). Cf. item No. 256.

Officiant: Virgilius (Geo. 1, 69) “*illic officiant laetis ne frugibus herbae*”. (OF 51. No label LPTVC)

letae T; ne T omits; vae V ve L; leti sue PC; fragibus L.

At this line Serv. gives: noceant, obstent; and BS: obsint vel noceant. With this latter scholium Abstrusa (131, 45) agrees. It is not impossible therefore that from the original

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

‘Abstrusa’-item our present gloss has omitted the interpretation of the lemma, while the extant Abstrusa-gloss has omitted the illustration.

197 *Celei* *<supellex>*: *genus vasis viminei, Graece.* (Geo. 1, 165)
 “*virgea praeterea Celei vilisque supellex*”. (CE 156.
 Gloss LPTV)

Celel LPTV (twice); bimineus LP vimineus T -eum V; supplex LPT
 suplex V.

‘*Celei*’ is found in only this line of Virgil. cf. No. 198.

198 *Celeus*: *cui Donatus dicit a Cerere rustici operis instru-*
menta fuisse monstrata. unde Virgilius (Geo. 1, 165)
 “*Celei vilisque supellex*” dixit. (CE 188. Gloss. LPTV)
 dicit acterrat L dicit acterrae PTV; celesque P caelesqui L celeque TV;
 subpellex P supplex TV.

There is no doubt that this item comes from a scholium. cf. Serv.: *id est vasa de vimine, qualia Ceres Celeo aliquando monstravit, ut qualos, corbes, et cetera.* This and No. 197 raise the question of the nature of the scholia from which the citation-items are supposed to have come. Item 197 corresponds to the first part of the Servian scholium, while this is parallel to the second. It is then not impossible that out of a single unified scholium the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ made two items, and quoted the line or part of it with each. But it may be that the scholia were of the variorum-type like BS, and that the two items represent two different sources on which the compiler of the variorum-commentary drew.

199 *Talpa*: *genus <animalis> muri similis.* Virgilius (Geo. 1,
 183) “*aut oculis capti fodere cubilia talpae*”. feminini
<generis>; *genus animalis muribus <similis>*, noxium
 hortis. (TA 137. No label LPTVC. Appears also in
 PP)

mari PC; virgilii T virgilius C omits; capte V; talpe TC talpe fmi G (omitting the remainder); animal V; auribus PC; hostis PC.

If this item is a fusion of two separate ones, it is clear from G that the items were fused in the common source of Lib. and PP (probably ‘Abstrusa’). We may however look upon

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

this item as another hint that the Virgil-commentary used was of the variorum-type. Serv. and BS merely note the gender in the Virgil-line. cf. Dub. Nom. 592, 1: *Talpas generis masculini ut mures*.

Bubo: genus avis. Virgilius (Geo. 1, 184) “inventusque cavis bufo et *quae* plurima terrae monstra ferunt”. (BU 4. Isid LPT; no label V)

inventumque LPTV; bubo LPT bubonem V; monstraverunt PTV.

The label given by most MSS. should refer to BU 5 (= Is. Et. 12, 7, 39). This item clearly arises from a confusion between ‘bubo’ and ‘bufo’. Two explanations are possible:— (1) a wrong reading in Geo. 1, 184 (‘bubo’ for ‘bufo’) led to this interpretation in a scholium on that line; (2) alternatively we may suppose that at Aen. 4, 462 (*sola bubo*), where Serv. notes the unusual gender, a scholiast may have been misled by a wrong reading or a faulty memory into citing Geo. 1, 184 for an example of the more common gender. cf. Dub. Nom. 572, 28.

Medicor: medicor illam rem et medicor illi rei dicitur, ut (Geo. 2, 135) “senibus medicantur anhelis”, et (Geo. 1, 193) “semina vidi equidem multos medicare serentes”. (ME 40. No label LPTVCA)

Medaor P (not L); res dicitur PC; unsensibus LPCA unde sensibus TV; angelis et LTVA angelus PC; vidie equidem equidem mult. V vidiae aequidem equidem PC vidie equidem aequidem T vidie equidem m. A; multis T multus V; serantes PC.

On Geo. 1, 193 Serv. writes:—sane medicor accusativum regit ut ‘medicor illam rem’; ‘medeor’ vero ‘illi rei’ dicimus; nam ‘medeor illam rem’ figuratum est. On Aen. 7, 756 however he writes:—‘medicor illam rem’ et ‘illi rei’, sicut ‘modulor’. There is no doubt that this item is part of a similar scholium.

Lembum: navem. Virgilius Georgicis (1, 201) “non aliter quam qui adverso vix flumine lembum remigiis subigit.” carabum brevissimum intellegere debemus, sic enim alia appellatione dicitur et cumba et caupilus, navicula piratarum. (LE 101. No label LPTVAW)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Lembus A; navem ure g non aliter LPA navem brevem aliter TV; a remigiis L; curabum P; et cumba—piratarum P omits; pratarum LP².

Serv. and BS at this place give only: naviculam brevem. It seems however that Is. Et. 19, 1, 25 (=Lib. LE 102: Lembus navicula brevis, qui alia appellatione dicitur et cumba et caupilus, sicut et lintris, id est carabus, quem in Pado paludibusque utuntur) is from a scholium somewhat similar to our item.

203 Incusum: instructum. Virgilius (Geo. 1, 274) “lapidemque revertens incusum”, asini lateri *(in)positum* dixit. (IN 348. No label LPV)

Incussum LPV (twice); asinu V.

The interpretation and explanation depend on a faulty text of Geo. 1, 274-5 which was possibly cited at Aen. 1, 69 (incute); or perhaps the text was accurate and the scholarship of the scholiast a little weak.

204 Lepores auritos: aures grandes habentes, masculini generis. Virgilius (Geo. 1, 308) “auritosque sequi lepores”. (LE 202. No label LPTV. Appears also in PP)

masli gnr urg G; seque LPTG; leporem LPT.

BS give: aures grandes habentes. Serv. in a similar note quotes Horace for ‘auritas quercus’, which perhaps may explain why there is a note on the gender in our item.

205 “Lactentia” (Verg. Geo. 1, 315): quasi suco lacteo; dictum de segetibus. (LA 186. Gloss. LP)

secretibus P.

Besides this item there are others in Lib. which seem to be the fragments of a long scholium, or rather of a set of scholia, on Geo. 1, 315, i.e. items No. 27, 104, 167, and 168. If we make any attempt to reconstruct the material from which the compiler of ‘Abstrusa’ derived his items, we have for guides to the general sense the scholium of Serv. (Lactantia: adhuc tenuia et lactis plena et sciendum inter ‘lactantem’ et ‘lactentem’ hoc interesse quod ‘lactans’ est quae lac praebet, ‘lactens’ cui praebetur; repeated in BS and in Is. Diff. I 337) and the passage of Caper cited in the notes

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

to item No. 27. There is however an initial difficulty. Caper gives 'lactens' both as 'qui lacte alitur' and as 'lacte abundans'; 'lactans' he reserves for the meaning 'qui decipit'. On the other hand item No. 104 gives two opposite meanings to 'lactans'. The Virgil-scholia agree neither with Caper nor with item 104. What are we to do with these discrepancies? If we turn to those passages of classical authors where the words are used, it seems possible, in spite of some uncertainty in the MSS., that although the words 'lacteo' and 'lacto' were originally distinct in meaning, they were confused by Roman writers themselves. At the very least, we should say that soon after the end of the classical period the distinction became so uncertain that commentators and grammarians (and consequently the scribes and correctors of manuscripts) floundered. So far then from gaining anything by emending Caper, Serv., and the items of Lib. with a view to conformity, we should probably only achieve a fictitious and misleading distinction between the words, to which neither Caper nor Serv. would entirely have assented. The varieties of interpretation which we find in the Lib.-items are easily explained when we remember that the source of 'Abstrusa' was probably a variorum-commentary. One scholiast, relying on one set of quotations and examples, would draw his distinction between the words in one way; another in another way, and a third would fail to find any distinction at all. The full scholium (or rather set of scholia) I suppose to have read somewhat as follows:—

Lactentia: quasi suco lacteo, dictum de segetibus (=No. 205): inter lactantem et lactentem hoc interest quod lactans est quae lac praebet, lactens cui lac praebetur (= Serv.). *<aliter: >* et qui lacte nutriuntur et ipsae quae nutriunt participialiter lactantes dici possunt; de quo plena sunt lactantes, ut Ovidius 'lactantia ubera' (=No. 104). *<item aliter: >* lactans est quod lacte alit, lactens quod lacte alitur; et lactans qui decipit (=No. 27), quasi cum lacte, *<id est >* cum fraude; lactare *<enim >* est circumvenire, fraude vocare ut Terentius 'nisi me lactasses amantem'; unde et oblectare dictum est (=Nos. 167, 168); et lactens lacte abundans, *<ut Ennius >* 'lactentes ficos' *<et >* Lucilius 'lactentia coagula cum melle *<bibi >*'; et lactea: candida, ut Horatius 'lactea) laudas bracchia' = No. 27). Cf. Class. Quart. 15, 194.

206 Scabra: vetusta. Virgilius (Geo. 1, 495) “exesa inveniet scabra robagine pila”. (SC 7. Gloss. LPTVCA. Appears also in PP)

Scabris G; exsesa LPA etsesa T excesa G; invenit LPTVCG; scrabra G; rubagine PC rubigene L rubine pila G.

Abolita (167, 43) also gives this same unusual interpretation of the lemma-word. Our item therefore may be an ‘Abolita’-item, which the extant Abolita has preserved only in part.

207 Frondeum: frondeum est quod de frondibus totum est; frondosum quod frondes habet. (Geo. 2, 5) “pampineo Autumno”. (FR 221. Gloss. LA; no label P)

The quotation in this item was used as an illustration of Virgil’s use of adjectives in ‘-eus’ in a scholium on Aen. 1, 191. cf. Serv. and BS at Geo. 2, 5:—pampineo pro pampinoso, ut nemus frondeum pro frondosum. cf. also item No. 221 where the scholium on Aen. 1, 191 is reconstructed.

208 Poma (= Is. 17, 6, 24+gloss. med.+gloss. Bibl.)+omnia poma Latine feminini fere sunt generis, exceptis paucis ut (Aen. 12, 766) “hic oleaster”; hoc siler, Vergiliut (Geo. 2, 12) “ut molle siler”; item ut hoc buxum, licet et haec buxus dicatur; nam superfluam quidam volens facere discretionem ut haec buxus de arbore dicatur, buxum vero de ligno conposito. (PO 165. Isid. LP)

ut nolo siler P¹ nole LP²; item hoc Serv. Aen. 12, 766; superfluum LP; dicatur L dicamus P dicamus Serv.; conpositum LP.

This addition to a long item derived from various sources is the scholium of Serv. on Aen. 12, 766.

209 Corna: genus arboris. Vergilius (Geo. 2, 34) “et prunis lapidosa rubescere corna”. (CO 2245. No label PTV) L omits entirely; pronis P; coroa P (not TV).

Serv. on Aen. 3, 649 writes:—Lapidosa corna: ipsa arbor cornus dicitur, pomum vero cornum; inde corna, ut templum, templa. In Abstrusa we have:—Corna: poma silvestria (45, 2). Combining the two hints, this present item may be

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

emended to: *Cornus*: genus arboris; corna, poma silvestria. From the same set of scholia there probably also came Lib. LA 318^{bis}—*Lapidosa corna*: cornus genus est arboris; sed lapidosa ideo ait vel quia inter saxa magis crescit genus istut arboris vel quia bacae ipsius ossa in se durissima habent.

Capere: eligere, ut (Geo. 2, 230) “ante locum capies oculis”.
(CA 296. Placidi LPTVA)

This item = Serv. on Aen. 1, 396. The label then is probably an error for De Gls. cf. Part I §21.

Pandis: curvis ut (Geo. 2, 445) “et pandas ratibus posuere carinas”. (PA 263. No label LPTVC)
curbis LPC; curvi sunt T; pandis TV (not C)

The lemma is not an obvious form. We therefore conclude that the item is from a scholium on Geo. 2, 194, where SD writes:—et ‘pandis’ cavis, ut ipse alibi ‘et pandas rat. pos. carinas’.

Pales: dea pastoralis Pagani dicebant. Virgilius (Geo. 3, 1)
“te quoque magna Pales, et te, memorande, canemus”.
(PA 150. No label LPTVC)

dea apostoralis PC; memoranda LPTVC; caremus PC.

Compare Serv. and BS:—dea pastoralis. ‘Pagani’ is a hint that the collection of Virgil-scholia, from which this item probably came, was drawn up by a Christian. Is. Et. 17, 3, 19 came from a similar source:—gentiles autem paleam a quadam Pale frugum inventrice nominaverunt quam Cererem esse volunt; de qua Vergilius ‘te q. m. P. et te memoranda canemus’. The coincidence of the reading ‘memoranda’ in Is. and Lib. cannot be properly taken as evidence that our item is a recast of Is., for in Is. there is nothing quite parallel to the interpretation of the lemma; for such a parallel we turn to Serv. and BS.

Aonias: amnis. Virgilius (Geo. 3, 11) “Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas”. (AO 3. No label LPTV)
aonia red. P; verticem LP (not TV)

The lemma-word will not be found in any text of Virgil; but BS at Ecl. 6, 65 give ‘Aonias Musas’ as a variant reading

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

for 'Aonas in montes'. We may therefore tentatively regard the lemma as a reference to that line. But what of the absurd interpretation? Again we turn to Ecl. 6 where in line 64 there is a reference to Permessus, which doubtless may have been interpreted as 'amnis'. Our item is then to be taken as a confusion of two scholia on Ecl. 6, 64-65. cf. No. 218.

214 **Gangaridum:** Virgilius (Geo. 3, 26-27) "solidoque elephanto Gangaridum faciam victorisque arma Quirini". (GA 95. No label LPV)

The full scholium, of which this item is a part, may be reconstructed from Lib. GA 92, 94-96 thus:-Solidoque—Quirini: Ganges est fluvius Armeniae (=94) *vel* amnis Indiae (=96, labelled De Gls.); Gangarida *est* India, a rege Gangaro; nam et Gangarides nigros conterminos esse Indis verum est (=92).

215 **Cynthius:** auctor Troiae. Virgilius (Geo. 3, 36) "et Troiae Cynthius auctor". (CI 209. No label LPTV)

Cintius P Cincius LTV; auc. Throiae L trohiie P; Vergilius L; Troiae L; cinctius P cincius LTV.

Since the interpretation repeats the citation we conclude that it was not intended to explain the line cited; but rather that Geo. 3, 36 was adduced in a long scholium on Ecl. 6, 3.

216 **Tenus:** praepositionem Virgilius necessitate metri genetivo plurali iunxit, ut (Geo. 3, 53) "crurum tenus a mento palearia pendent". (TE 387. No label LP)

metri necess.: Audax (354, 15); genet. casui numeri pluralis praeposuit ut . . . : Audax.

If this item is not directly taken from Audax (cf. Part I §51) we must regard it as a part of a Virgil-scholium based on Audax. Serv. and BS treat 'tenus' in this line as an adverb.

217 **Camuris:** Virgilius (Geo. 3, 55) "et camuris hirtae sub cornibus aures". (CA 583. No label LPTVAW)

Camariri TV; v. erga muros ite sub c. auris TV; cam. iste PAW; irte L.

With this item, as part of the same scholium, should be combined CA 584:—Camuris: curvis; unde et camera appell-

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

latur. Cf. Serv. at this line:—Camuris, id est curvis; unde et camerae appellantur. From the scholium Lib. has presumably made two items, one containing the interpretation, and the other citing the line of Virgil.

Obtunsum: ex omni parte tunsum, id est repandum vel hebes; ut facile intellegit qui vim verborum animadverterit; ut (Geo. 3, 103) “campum” pro circo, “ruunt” (=ib. 104) pro exeunt, “currus” (=ib. 104) pro equis. (OB 718. No label LP)

haerbes it facile LP; animadverteret LP; aequis L.

As this item stands in the MSS., the citations of words from Geo. 3, 103-104 have nothing to do with the first part of the item. But the difficulty proves to be easy of solution. In the first place, Is. Et. (10, 198) gives us:—Obtunsus, hebetior vel obclusior, quasi ex omni parte tunsus. Is. obtained his item from a source similar to the source of the first part of our item, and the adjectival comparatives in his interpretation seem to point to Geo. 3, 135-6 (ne luxu obtunsior usus sit genitali arvo). If in the second place we turn to Serv. and BS at Geo. 3, 136 we find them interpreting the phrase ‘genitali arvo’ and pointing out how Virgil ‘rem turpem vitavit a translationibus’. They add other examples of his ‘translationes’. Now basing our insertions on Serv. and BS we have only to write:—Obtunsior: obtunsum *est* ex omni parte . . . animadverterit. Genitali arvo: translative pro muliebri folliculo; ut ‘campum’ pro circo . . . ‘currus’ pro equis: it then becomes plain that our item, like No. 213, is only a confusion of two neighbouring scholia.

Rumpent: pro impleverunt. Virgilius (Geo. 3, 328) “et cantu querulae rumpent arbusta cicadae”; ergo ‘rumpent’ impleverunt. (RU 137. Gloss. LPVC. Appears also in PP)

implebunt G; urg G; et cacta querile P et catta L et cuctaq; rule C qu; ruge L cantaq; rule G et tacta quervi erumpent V; cicadea LPVCG.

The lemma, as we see from the interpretation, was originally in the perfect, but has been altered to suit the citation.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

The item therefore comes from a scholium on Geo. 1, 49, where BS gives:—Ruperunt, impleverunt.

220 Hiantis: hiulcas, ut (Aen. 1, 106) “his unda dehiscens”.
(HI 8. No label LP)

higulgas P higulcas L; nuda deiscens LP.

The lemma shows that the item is from a scholium on Geo. 1, 91 (venas hiantis). The citation is used as an illustration of a verb of cognate meaning, and the scholium probably distinguished between a group of verbs as Serv. does (Aen. 1, 106 and 123).

221 “Nemora inter frondea” (Aen. 1, 191): inter frondosas arbores. (In PP only)

Nem. inter frondosa G.

On this line Serv. writes:—*Frondea pro frondosa posuit; plerumque enim dum varietati declinationis student poetae, mutant proprietatem; nam frondeum est totum de frondibus, ut torus; frondosus vero est lucus; licet enim abundet frondibus, non tamen est de frondibus totus; ut saxeus et saxosus* (cf. also Is. Diff. I 223.) We are therefore justified in reconstructing a parallel scholium from this item and No. 207 as follows:—*Nemora inter frondea: inter frondosas arbores. <frondeum autem posuit pro frondosum. nam> frondeum est quod de frondibus est; frondosum quod frondes habet, <ut> ‘pampineo Autumno’ <dixit pro pampinoso>*.

222 Praevertit et praevertitur dicimus quia verbum est activum; loco suo tamen et pro se invicem verba ponuntur, ut in Virgilio (Aen. 1, 317) “volucremque fuga praevertitur Hebrum” pro praevertit. (PR 1181. Plac. PTVCA. Appears also in PP)

L omits entirely; veruum G; loco loco suo P; tamen ipse invicem P (not G); fugata G; Hebrum pro vertit P.

Compare Serv. and SD:—*Praevertitur, id est transit. dicimus autem et praevertit et praevertitur nova ratione. nam passiva declinatione utimur in activa significatione, ut hoc loco. praevertimur enim cum ipsi praemus, cum autem activa declinatio est passivam habet significationem, ut ‘ille me*

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

praevertit'. Cf. No. 129, which comes from the same scholium as this item. The label is probably a mistake for De Gl's; for in the Roman MSS. of Placidus there is no parallel item (cf. Part I §21).

Redolent: olent; sed hoc interest quod olent res vel malae vel bonae, redolent tantum bonae. Virgilius (Aen. 1, 436) <“Redolentque thymo”>. (RE 447. No label LP)

Virgilius R (i.e. ‘require’) L Virg. respondit P. cf. G 142, 12.

Of this item G has preserved only:—Redolent olent vel male vel bone olent bene. Compare SD on the line cited:—Redolent: quidam olere res vel malas vel bonas, redolere tantum bonas tradunt.

Hausit: vidit. Virgilius, ut (Aen. 4, 661) “⟨h⟩auriat hunc oculis ⟨ignem⟩”. hausit: audivit, ut (Aen. 4, 359) “vocemque his auribus hausit”. hausit: animadvertisit, ut (Aen. 12, 26) “simul hoc animo hauri”. hausit: adtrahit, reprimet. ⟨h⟩ausit: bibit, ut nunc (Aen. 1, 738) “ille impiger hausit”. (HA 140. No label LP)

auribus ausit hausit LP; animo hausit aut sit adtrahit LP.

Of this item G has preserved only these two fragmentary glosses:— Hausit [b] vidit ut ‘auriat hunc oculis ignem’ (107, 19) and :— Hausit audibit ut ‘vocemque his auribus hausit’ (107, 20).

‘Nunc’ defines the place of the scholium from which this item came. It is not impossible therefore that the first words should be ‘hausit bibit’, as the first of the PP items also hints. Serv. at this line writes:—Hausit modo accepit, nec possumus intellegere ‘bibit’ cum hoc sequitur ‘et pleno se proluit auro’; alibi vidit, ut ‘hausit caelum mentemque recepit’; alibi audivit, ut ‘vocemque his auribus hausit’; alibi vulnerat, ut ‘latus hausit apertum’; et multa alia pro loco significat.

Our item therefore is parallel to a scholium which Serv. or his authority was attacking.

Triones: aboriginum lingua aratores boves triones, quasi terriones, dicebantur. Virgilius (Aen. 1, 744) “geminosque Triones”. (TR 329. Gloss. LPVC; no label T)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

bobes LPTC; triciones quasi T; geminosquitrones PC.

At this line of Virgil SD writes:—*id est septentriones . . . et proprie triones sunt boves aratorii qui terram terunt.* When the phrase recurs at Aen. 3, 516, he writes:—*Varro autem ait boves triones dici.* cf. Varro, Ling. Lat. 7, 74 and Isid. 3, 71, 7.

226 Cum caneret: *id est cum canere vellet, ut* (Aen. 2, 111) “*terruit Auster <euntes>*”. (CU 121. Vergili LPV; no label T)

vellit L; et terruit LP.

The label is probably a slip for De Gls or may be a guess by the scribe of the archetype. At Ecl. 6, 3 (Cum canerem reges) Philargyrius writes:—*id est cum canere vellem; ut ‘terruit Auster euntes’ pro ire volentes.* The parallel is striking and our item is to be regarded as part of a scholium on Ecl. 6, 3. The lemma-form is due to that remodelling of items which made a glossary more generally useful.

The word ‘euntes’ which LP omit is to be found as an intruder in a garbled and defective gloss of Lib. (CU 122), which formed part of the same scholium:—*Cum canerem reges: dicitur enim res (rex MSS.) Romanorum [reum euntis] primo scribere cogitasse et misso proposito <ad> Bucolica <transisse>.*

227 Squalens: una pars orationis et sordes significat et ornatum. sordes cum dicit (Aen. 2, 277) “*squalentem barbam*” squalore; ornatum, ut (Aen. 12, 87) “*auro squalentem loricam*” squamis. (SQ 2. No label LPTVC)

Sq. capax orationis LPTVC; sodes cum TV; ornatum tauros qualentem PC; aornatumtauro T; ut L omits.

Compare SD at Aen. 2, 277:—*Squalentem: modo sordidam alibi (10, 314) luculentem ‘per tunicam squalentem auro’ a squamis; and Serv. on Geo. 4, 91:—Squalentibus: splendentibus; quod a squamis venit, ut ‘squamis auroque trilicem’; nam si a squalore est sordidum significat ut ‘squalentem barbam’.*

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Sacer: dicitur et venerandus et execrandus. Virgilius (Aen. 3, 57) “auri sacra fames”. (SA 46. No label LPVC)

This item is clearly not a casual marginal note, but the comment of an observant scholiast. Compare Serv. on Aen. 1, 632:—hinc etiam sacrum et venerabile et exsecrandum intellegimus.

“Carbasus” (Aen. 3, 357): lini species, sed nunc pro velis posuit. (CA 801. Gloss. LP)

Carvasus LP.

This item is also found unlabelled, at CA 641. Compare Serv.:—genus lini est, quod abusive plerumque pro vela ponitur.

(Sub)temine: trama. Virgilius (Aen. 3, 483) “fert picturatas auri subtemine vestes”. (TE 160. Gloss. LPTVCAW)

pictura PVCW pictura LTA; thesauri LPVCA thesauris TW; sub tegmine V; vester LPTVC.

Since the interpretation is not a common word, the parallel provided by Serv. (Auri subtemine, id est filo quod intra stamen currit; quod Persius (6, 73) tramam dixit) is striking.

Harundo: sagitta; quia Cupidinem sagittas dicebant amorum habere Pagani; unde (Aen. 4, 73) “letalis harundo”, amor usque ad mortem. raro autem invenitur canna a veteribus dicta, nisi tantum a Varrone. (HA 104. No label LP. Appears also in PP)

Cupionem P; cupidinem amorum abere pag. G; laetales P; cannam LP (not G); dictam LP (not G).

‘Pagani’ gives us a hint that this item is from a Christian source, and the mention of Varro indicates that the source is learned; that is to say, this item is from a Christian commentary on Virgil. Compare Is. Et. 17, 7, 57:—Arundo dicta quod cito arescat; hanc veteres cannam vocaverunt, arundinem postea.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

232 Limbum: clavum transversum in veste, ut (Aen. 4, 137)
 “Sidoniam picto chalmydem circumdata limbo”. (LI
 295. No label LPTV)

clabum T; clamide LPTV; circumlata LPTV.

Serv. at this line refers us back to Aen. 2, 616 (insedit limbo effulgens), where SD writes:—Nimbo fulgens, nube divina . . . alii nimum clavum transversum in veste existimant, alii limbo legunt, ut ‘Sidoniam picto chlam. circ. limbo.’ Our item may therefore be part of a similar scholium on Aen. 2, 616.

233 Yaspis: gemma generis feminini. Virgilius (Aen. 4, 261)
 “iaspide fulva”; nam viridis est, sed pro viridi fulvam posuit; ut alibi ‘flavam’ dicit (Aen. 5, 309) “flavaque caput nectentur oliva”. (YA 11. No label PT. Appears also in PP)

L omits entirely. Iaspis gema g. G; foeminini P; iaspides PT (-yas- P) iaspis de ful. G; fulvam dicit fulvaque P; fluvam dicit fluvamque kapit nectenatur T.

SD on Aen. 4, 261 writes:—iaspide autem fulva pro viridi, ut ‘fulvaque caput nect. oliva’. Notice that our item is fuller and clearer than SD.

234 Suscepimus: ad animum et mentem refertur, ut (Aen. 6, 629) “susceptum perfice munus”; suscipimus corpore, ut (Aen. 4, 391) “suscipiunt famulae conlapsaque membra”; suscipimus aliquem venerantes. (SU 960. No label LP)

susceptumunus P; profice LP; membram L.

This item agrees with Caper 98, 5. cf. Part I §51.

235 Sunto: sint. Virgilius (Aen. 4, 624) “nullus amor populis nec foedera sunto”. (SU 663. No label LPTVC. Appears also in PP)

sunt TV; Vergilius P; federa PTCG.

In his comment on this line SD writes:—. . . sunto autem id est sint; . . . Urbanus dicit verbo eum iuris usum propter odia hereditaria. The last words of SD are somewhat

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

obscure. In what way is 'sunto' a legal word and what has it to do with hatred or inheritance? The following item of Lib., which doubtless was originally a part of the same scholium as SU 663, gives us the clue:—*Sunto: sint; iuris verbum est et testamentarium 'ceteri ceteraeque omnes exheredes sunt'*. Lib. gives us the phrase whereby Urbanus supported his comment.

Defuncte: liberate. Virgilius (Aen. 6, 83) "pelagi defuncte periclis". (DE 460. No label LPTV)

liberatur P; pelagii L; defunte T; periculis LPTV.

Serv. at this line notes:—defuncte autem liberate.

Piram: congeriem lignorum. Virgilius (Aen. 6, 214) "pinguem taedis et robore secto ingentem struxere pyram". (PI 186. No label LPTVCAW)

tedis LPTC; setto T; ing. in sacsoxere PC ing. incosuxere L ing. in quo suxere A ing. in quo sucxere W ing. inscorum erepiram T ing. struxere (after an erasure) V; piram LPCAW.

From the confusion of the MSS., the reading 'ingentem instruxere' seems to emerge. For the interpretation, compare Serv. at Aen. 11, 185:—pyra est lignorum congeries.

Rostro: ore. Virgilius (Aen. 6, 597) "rostrosque inmanis vultur obunco inmortale iecur tondens". (RO 158. No label LPVC)

rostrosque LPVC; vultus C; adunco LPVC; tundens LPVC.

In PP we have:—Rostro: os co greci rigchos dicunt rostro hore urg rostroque inmanis uultur adunco inmortale iecur tondens. The first part of this is paralleled by Lib. RO 159:—Rostru(m) os quod Graeci $\rho\gamma\chi\sigma$ dicunt; proprie autem rostrum dicitur quod incurvum est, ut vulturis, accipitris, vel reliquis avibus. Doubtless all three items have come by way of 'Abstrusa' from a scholium on Aen. 6, 597.

Incana: valde cana; dicitur enim mentum canum habuisse Sabinus qui fuit Numa. unde et Virgilius (Aen. 6, 809) "crines incanaque menta regis Romani". (IN 89. Vergili LPVW; no label A)

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

canum P omits; abuisse L abuiss sab. P; Sabinis LPVAW; barbas inc. LPVAW; reges P.

The label given by the MSS. is probably an error; for the item is not of the type usually found in the glosses derived from marginal notes in Virgil-MSS. The error of 'barbas' for 'crines' is found also in Is. Diff. I 76, which presumably came from a scholium similar to the source of the present item.

240 Ex ordine: ex numero. (Aen. 7, 140) "et duplicis caeloque Ereboque. (EX 745. No label LPTV)
duplici V; caelo quaereboq TV.

The citation given by the MSS. is curiously curtailed, and does not illustrate the lemma. If we turn to Aen. 7, 139-140 (Idaeumque Iovem Phrygiamque ex ordine matrem invocat et dupl. cael. Er. parentis) we shall realize that in this item we have one short scholium followed by the lemma-phrase of the next scholium.

241 Lituum: baculum incurvum quo augures utuntur, ut (Aen. 7, 187) "ipse Quirinali lituo". (LI 573. No label LP)
ipsi LP; litio LP.

Compare Serv. at this line:—lituus est incurvum augurum baculum quo utebantur ad designanda caeli spatia.

242 Cateiae: Gallica lingua hastae dicuntur; cum enim carmen totum loquella Romana composuisset Virgilius, hic tamen dixit (Aen. 7, 741) "Teutonico ritu soliti torquere cateias", id est hastas mittere consueti. (CA 989. No label LP)

astae L aste P; totum L omits; ritus LP; siliti P; aettias L.

Compare SD at this line:—Cateias tela Gallica; unde et Teutonicum ritum dixit. cateiam quidam asserunt teli genus esse tale quale aclydes sunt . . . cateias, id est hastas. cateiae lingua Theotisca hastae dicuntur. Compare also Is. 18, 7, 7:—Clava est qualis fuit Herculis . . . haec et cateia quam Horatius 'caiam' (acinaces?) dixit. est enim genus Gallici teli . . . huic meminit Vergilius dicens 'teut. ritu sol. torq. cateias'. unde et eos Hispani et Galli tautanos vocant (=Lib. CA 988). Compare also item No. 30 and TA 269 (Tautanos idem et clavos, labelled De Gls.).

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Thanks to the hints of Serv. and Isid., we may reconstruct from the items of Lib., the Virgil-scholium used by the compiler of 'Abstrusa' as follows:—

Soliti torquere cateias: id est hastas mittere consueti. cateiae Gallica lingua hastae vel lanceae dicuntur; cum enim carmen totum loquella Romana composuisset Virgilius, hic tamen 'cateias' dixit; sicut Horatius 'acinaces' posuit pro gladiis Medorum. cateias et tautanos vocant Galli.

Ferrugine: ferrugo proprie est purpura magis nigra quam rubens, quae fit in Hispania, ut (Aen. 9, 582) "ferrugine clarus Hibera". (FE 440. No label LPV)
clarus hiberat LP (not V).

Notice that this item is fuller than Serv. Geo. 1, 467 (Obscura ferrugine: alibi et 'ferrugine clarus'. ferrugo autem est purpura nigrior Hispana) or Is. 19, 28, 6 (Ferrugo color est purpurae subnigrae quae fit in Hispania ut 'ferr. cl. Hib.' = Lib. FE 442).

Corticis amarae: novae; genere feminino; alibi (Aen. 9, 743) "cortice crudo" et (Aen. 7, 742) "raptus de subere cortex". (CO 2320. No label P)

L omits entirely. mare nove P.

As the lemma-phrase indicates, this item is from a scholium on Ecl. 6, 63 where Serv. writes:—Amarae corticis: alibi ait 'raptus de subere cortex'; quod magis sequi debemus ut masculino utamur.

Corticem: corium arboris. Vergilius (Aen. 9, 743) "ille rudem nodis et cortice crudo intorquet summis adnixus viribus hastam"; generis masculini. (CO 2319. No label PTV)

L omits entirely. coreum T; notis TV; adnixis PTV; asta genus PTV.

The label De Gls. attached to the preceding item in Lib. (CO 2318, an excerpt from Isid.) should perhaps refer to this item.

Virgil does not use the accusative form; but of course a scholiast may quite well have done so in his note.

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

It may be thought that since item No. 244 also quotes this line of Virgil, both items cannot be from the same scholium; but since one of the sources of 'Abstrusa' was probably a variorum-commentary, two notes on the same line, derived from different sources, may quite well have given the same grammatical note and have supported it by the same citation.

Compare also Dub. Nom. 576, 7: *Corticem priores genere feminino dixerunt; sed nunc masculino genere dici debet, ut ut Ovidius 'rupto cortice' et Virgilius.*

246 *C(h)alybum* <stricturae>: *ferri metalla.* Virgilius (Aen. 10, 174) "insula inexhaustis *C(h)alybum generosa metallis*". (CA 200. Gloss LPAW; no label TV)
inexcusatis LPTAW (not V).

The interpretation shows that something of the lemma has been lost. It cannot be the word 'insula'; for the interpretation would then be senseless. Since the genitive form is found again at Aen. 8, 421, we are justified in supplying 'stricturae'. At that line Serv. writes:—*strictura est terra ferri in massam coacta . . . unde modo Chalybum posuit stricturas pro ferri massis.*

247 *Thesauri(s): quasi* <aurum> *servanti(bus)* ac *conservanti-*
bus; (. . . .) quia *qui eos servant* *parci dicuntur, ut* (Aen. 10, 531) "argenti atque auri memoras quae multa
talenta natis parce <tuis>". (TE 559. Gloss. LP)

Thesauri R et quasi P Thesauri quasi eruanti L; hac LP; porci LP; dicantur P; arg. aquae LP; auri mensurasq; L, mensuras quia P; gnatis pargetur L gnati spargetur P.

This item is seriously corrupt; but from the case of the words in the interpretation it may be inferred that the item is from a scholium on Geo. 4, 229. It seems necessary to posit a lacuna before 'quia'; and the scholiast seems to have taken 'parce' in his citation as a vocative singular.

BIBLICAL CITATIONS

248 *Peducas: laquei sunt quo pedes inlaqueantur; de quibus in* Iob (18, 10) "abscondita est in terra peduca eius". (PE 132. No label LPV)

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

Pedicae V; de quibus pedes V.

The lemma points to Geo. 1, 307 where Serv. writes:—
Pedicas laqueos quibus pedes inlaqueantur (cf. Is. 15, 27, 8).
A Christian commentator has added a Biblical illustration.

Sale conditus: sapiens aut ordinatus vel temperatus; in
Apostolo (Coloss. 4, 6) “ut sermo tuus sit semper in
gratia *sale* conditus”. (SA 182. Gloss. LPVC)

This citation is from an Itala-text; for the Vulgate reads:—
Sermo vester semper in gratia sale sit conditus. In Abstrusa
we have at 166, 5:—Salsus: sapiens aut ordinatus aut temper-
atus; and at 166, 6:—Sale conditus: quod supra. It is there-
fore highly probable that our present item is the genuine
'Abstrusa'-gloss which has been mangled in the epitome
which we now possess.

Note also Part I §48.

UNIDENTIFIED CITATIONS

Barba sterili: duribuccius. (BA 147. Gloss. LP)

duributius L.

Since 'duribuccius', which does not satisfactorily explain
the lemma-phrase, is itself a comic formation, the item is
probably not a lemma with an interpretation but, taken as a
whole, is a fragmentary citation from some lost comedy.

It is tempting to see some connexion between the item and
the Abstrusa-gloss (175, 43):—Sterillum barba de capro
(‘crapra’ and ‘capra’ in the MSS.) iocai, in spite of the diffi-
culty of deciding whether ‘barba’ is part of the lemma or not,
and whether the last word is ‘iocat’, ‘iocans’, ποκάς, or even a
corruption of ‘Lucilius’.

Commenting on Geo. 3, 366 (stiria impexis induruit horrida
barbis) BS seem to regard 'stiria' as connected with 'sterilis':—
Stiria umor de naribus fluens. stiriam umorem esse dicunt in
glaciem versum quod etiam per hiemen solet tectis dependere,
appellatum a duritia, a quo etiam mulier 'sterilis' dicitur quae
non molliatur partu. Relying perhaps on Virgil's 'induruit',
the scholiast seems to have taken 'stiria' as akin to στερέος

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

(cf. *appellatum a duritia*). Since 'barbis' occurs in the Virgil-line, may a scholium similar to that given in BS have added:—
 <et> 'barba sterili, duribuccius' de capro iocat *(comoedus)*?

251 Bifacis: mendacis. (BE 17. Gloss. LP)

befacis LP.

The lemma-word is attested nowhere else except in bilingual glossaries, where it is interpreted as $\deltaισπρόσωπος$ or $\deltaιττός$. It is possibly the merest fragment of a citation found in a scholium on e.g. Aen. 1, 661 (bilinguis), where words of a similar formation were discussed.

252 Casses: genus masculinum. Virgilius (Geo. 4, 247) *“laxos in foribus suspendit aranea cassis”* et Aemilius Macer *“suspendit teneros male fortis aranea cassis”*. (CA 825. No label LPTV)

Cases L; malefortisa ranea casses T; aranea cursis L.

The citation which is preserved is not unlike the Virgilian passage, but can scarcely be regarded as a garbled version of it. H. J. Thomson (in Amer. Journ. Phil. 43, 353) is responsible for the happy suggestion that we have here a fragment of Macer.

253 Decuriat convivas: aut cogit ad convivium aut in decem viros. (DE 198. Gloss. LP)

conbibas LP; cogitat LP (emended by Buecheler).

Nine was the normal number of guests, and the lemma, which is almost certainly a citation from a comedy, seems to have reference to the crowding of the tables by inviting an additional guest. The interpretation indicates that there was some word-play perhaps in the original context.

But what of the interpretation itself? As it stands with the emendation of Buecheler, it may be read as an iambic senarius; quite possibly it came from the same context as the lemma, and is the comedian's jocular explanation of his own phrase.

The whole item may be from Festus by way of 'Abolita' (cf. Paulus 66, 8:—Decures: decuriones) or from a Virgil-

IN MEDIEVAL LATIN GLOSSARIES

scholium on Aen. 7, 174 (Curia) by way of 'Abstrusa'.

Descriptivus: descriptioni op(p)ortunus et necessarius, ut
"totus hic locus descriptivus est". (DE 998. No label
LP)

Descriptibus P (-iptibus L); aut LP; descrip. LP.

The citation, if not a phrase concocted by a grammarian,
may be a remark found in some Virgil-scholium (of Donatus?).

Fingit: format. alias tergit. Cicero (Sest. 77) <"e foro
spongiis effungi sanguinem">; "pavimentum sfungia
fingebat" et (Virg. Aen. 8, 634) "corpora fingere lingua",
id est ursa natos. (FI 217. No label LPV)

pavi corripitur mentum LPV; fingebant LPV; corpore L; id est subsanatur
V.

Presumably from a scholium on Geo. 2, 407 (fingitque
putando). The Cicero-citation has fallen out, like the Virgil-
citation in No. 252. Although Serv. on Aen. 8, 634 (Corp.
fing. ling., id est tergere. Cicero in Sestiana 'spongiis sanguis
effingebatur', id est tergebatur) gives only a rough version of
the same Cicero-passage, our unidentified citation is too far
distant to be taken as a paraphrase of Cicero. The citation
from Aen. 8, 634 is from memory, as 'ursa' indicates. For
'ursa', cf. Donat. Vit. Verg.

The text of the MSS. 'pavi corripitur mentum' is due
probably to the fact that in the archetype of Lib. 'pavimentum'
was divided between two lines and in the margin there was a
note referring to the quantity. Subsequent transcribers did
not realize that 'corripitur' was a marginal jotting, and in-
corporated it as part of the word. Since 'pavimentum' was
noted as being an Ionic *a minore* in this place, the citation
was recognized as being from a metrical work; the emendation
to 'fingebat' is therefore justified. The quantities of 'pavi-
mentum' indicate that the citation is from some Christian
poet.

Panis (= Is. 20, 2, 15) + prius autem quam panis usus esset,
antiqui homines oleribus sive glande vixerunt. sicut et
poeta ait "mortales primi ructabant gutture glandem".

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

tantum enim pomis arborum et oleribus alebantur, sicut animalia herbis. (PA 304. No label LP)

guttore P.

This material which is fused with an Isidore-item may conveniently be derived from a scholium on Geo. 1, 8. Cf. No. 195.

257 Saetigerum: caprarum. (SE 636. Gloss. LPTC)

Setenum L Sedegenum P Setegenum C Set egonum T.

Compare SE 185 (Segenum caprarum, labelled De Gl.), SA 520 (Satigenum: caprarum, labelled De Gl.) and the Abolita-item (169, 38:—Saetigeri: caprarum grex).

Is our present item merely a garbled form of the Abolita-gloss (derived ultimately from Festus) or is it a fragment of a citation derived from a scholium on Aen. 7, 17 (saetigeri sues)?

258 Vict(it)antem: viventem. “nitidule sumptuose vict(it)antem”; dictum de femina. (VI 65. Gloss. LPTVCAW)

vivente T; leges ū tuo se L lege sūtuose L²A leges vel tuo se PC leges ve tuo re W lege sumptuose TV.

In a discussion of this item in Class. Quart. 16, 104, I pointed out the possibility that the citation is a comic fragment. To that discussion there is nothing to add, except to point out the confirmation the readings of TV afford for the emendations then proposed. The item is probably part of a Virgil-scholium on some part of ‘vivo’ or ‘victus’.

APPENDIX: VIRGIL-CITATION REFERENCES

Here are given references to all those items of Lib. not printed in Part II which contain comparatively unimportant citations from Virgil. Those marked with an asterisk may also be found in H. J. Thomson's *Ancient Lore in Medieval Latin Glossaries* (St. Andrews Univ. Publ. XIII pp. 62 ff.).

ECLOGUES: I 29 at PO 498; 62 at AR 34; 70 at *No. 297.
II 54 at MI 196.
III 8 at HI 167; 52 at QUI 147; 57 at *FO 192; 80
at ST 10; 90 at VA 253.
IV 10 at LU 81.
V 20 at NI 95.
VI 3 at CI 208; 17 at CA 482; 22 at TE 215; 35 at
NE 390; 74 at *SC 159.
VII 1 at AR 319; 10 at CE 584; 45 at *MU 337.
VIII 55 at UL 87; 65 at VE 270; 70 at CI 235.
X 15 at LI 102; 20 at *UV 5; 25 at LI 267; 36 at
VI 223.

GEORGICS: I 11 at DR 20; 38 at EL 174; 71 at *NO 297-8; 73
at FL 1; 74 at SI 214; 77 at AV 111; 109 at CA
619; 110 at AR 279; 112 at LU 456; 120 at IN
1864; 135 at EX 348; 136 at FL 287; 138 at LI
178; 156 at RU 189; 171 at *TE 164; 174 at ST
241; 193 at AM 351; 195 at SI 217; 212 at PA 329;
221 at AT 36; 228 at LE 155; 233 at ZO 8; 254 at
MA 810; 255 at CL 99; 261 at PR 1763; 266 at
FI 294; 292 at *IN 1587; 296 at AE 147; 298 at
*TO 212; 306 at *MI 195; 397 at *TE 363; 488
at CO 418 (cf. item No. 43).
II 8 at CO 2404; 13 at *SA 193; 23 at AB 336; 24 at
AR 616; 25 at SU 490; 30 at *CA 1044; 31 at OL
10; 35 at GE 95; 36 at FE 401; 46 at *EX 761;
64 at PA 332; 102 at BU 39; 110 at CR 24; 121
at TE 363; 154 at SP 171; 184 at UL 20; 192 at
*PA 745; 194 at EX 1186; 213 at CI 427; 242 at
CO 187; 353 at *HI 264; 363 at PA 201; 381 at
*PR 2819; 394 at LA 264; 396 at *VE 333; 396

QUOTATIONS FROM CLASSICAL AUTHORS

at CO 316; 408 at CR 93, FO 31; 409 at RE 577; 410 at ME 588; 412 at CO 248; 413 at RU 210; 417 at AN 399; 431 at CI 426; 449 at TO 150; 478 at *DE 328.

III 5 at BU 60; 11 at AO 4; 32 at TR 460; 38 at IX 1; 53 at PA 133 (cf. item No. 14); 59 at VE 321; 80 at OB 98^a (cf. item No. 2); 87 at DU 147; 92 at IU 3; 223 at AL 352, *RE 31.

IV 145 at ED 98; 303 at RA 101; 559 at CU 104.

AENEID: I 1 at AR 411, VI 357; 102 at *IA 46; 118 at NA 48; 123 at FA 614; 135 at QUO 124; 140 at IA 52; 237 at QUE 208; 399 at SI 403; 421 at MA 162; 436 at TI 121; 479 at AG 171; 586 at *FA 640; 654 at *MO 289; 665 at TI 152; 678 at CU 278; 704 at PE 417; 739 at VE 215.

II 71 at SU 687; 99 at VU 38; 126 at DI 204; 237 at SC 23; 249 at CO 2282; 393 at AD 49, CO 495; 492 at LA 6; 601 at LA 130; 776 at IN 510.

III 57 at FA 307; 109 at OB 620; 137 at *TA 35; 219 at LE 262; 293 at CA 259; 565 at MA 606; 608 at CR 90; 662 at ST 136; 705 at SE 242.

IV 67 at *TA 61, SU 297, VU 63; 191 at CR 154; 406 at CA 870; 491 at HO 127, OR 276; 505 at PI 224; 506 at CO 2282; 582 at CL 105.

V 40 at GA 160; 177 at CL 147; 250 at ME 175; 745 at FA 418.

VI 16 at TR 106; 33 at QUI 147; 201 at OL 20; 216 at CI 223, CU 265; 252 at ST 152; 263 at VA 36; 288 at CI 149; 311 at FO 192; 644 at *CO 2172; 742 at LU 314; 781 at EN 139; 824 at *TO 172.

VII 109 at AD 562; 232 at AB 255; 517 at NA 57; 583 at IL 30; 775 at LE 91.

VIII 116 at CO 2282; 160 at IU 48; 664 at EX 1353; 696 at SI 590.

IX 475 at FA 259.

X 95 at IA 33, IA 46; 322 at IA 46; 325 at *CI 69; 676 at MI 250; 711 at IN 1176.

XI 718 at PE 956.

XII 35 at RE 39; 247 at RO 11; 264 at DE 802.

Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

- I. The CUM Constructions: Their history and functions, by William Gardner Hale. Part i: Critical, 1887. Part ii: Constructive, 1889. (*Out of print.*)
- II. Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, 1887. (*Out of print.*)
- III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton, 1894.
(*Price \$1.20.*)
- IV. The Development of the Athenian Constitution, by George Willis Botsford, 1893. (*Price \$2.25.*)
- V. Index Antiphonteus, composit Frank Lovis van Cleef, 1895. (*Price \$1.50.*)
- VI. Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, by Herbert Charles Elmer, 1898. (*Price \$2.25.*)
- VII. The Athenian Secretaries, by William Scott Ferguson, 1898. (*Price 75 cents.*)
- VIII. The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes, by Fred Orlando Bates, 1898. (*Price 75 cents.*)
- IX. Critique of some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by Charles Edwin Bennett, 1898. (*Price 75 cents.*)
- X. The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries Before Christ, by William Scott Ferguson, 1899. (*Price, \$1.00.*)
- XI. Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia, confecerunt Catherina Maria Gloth, Maria Francisca Kellogg, 1900. (*Price \$1.50.*)
- XII. A Study of the Greek Paean, with Appendixes containing the Hymns found at Delphi and the other extant Fragments of Paean, by Arthur Fairbanks, 1900. (*Price \$1.50.*)

XIII. The Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus, not including Indirect Questions, by Charles L. Durham, 1901. (Price \$1.20.)

XIV. A Study in Case-Rivalry, being an Investigation Regarding the Use of the Genitive and Accusative in Latin with Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting, by Clinton L. Babcock, 1901. (Price 90 cents.)

XV. The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Latin, by K. P. R. Neville, 1901. (Price 90 cents.)

XVI. The Epigraphical Evidence for the Reigns of Vespasian and Titus, by Homer Curtis Newton, 1901. (Price \$1.20.)

XVII. Erichthonius and the Three Daughters of Cecrops, by Benjamin Powell. (Price 90 cents.)

XVIII. Index to the Fragments of the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets, as contained in the Hiller-Crusius edition of Bergk's Anthologia Lyrica, by Mary Corwin Lane, 1908. (Price \$1.20.)

XIX. The Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy in the Light of Homeric Usage, by Horace Leonard Jones, 1909. (Price \$1.20.)

XX. Gaius Verres: An historical study, by Frank Hewitt Cowles, 1917. (Price \$2.25.)

XXI. Quotations from Classical Authors in Medieval Latin Glossaries, collected and annotated by James Frederick Mountford, 1925. (Price \$1.50.)

Published for Cornell University by
Longmans, Green & Co., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York

BINDING SECT. FEB 191971

PA
25
C7
v.21

~~Cornell University~~
Cornell studies in
classical philology

CIRCULATE AS MONOGRAPH

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

CIRCULATE AS MONOGRAPH

